

DITON BOARD

STEVES, President
MONTGOMERY, Vice President
SPALDING, Secretary
WILSON, Treasurer
CAMPBELL, General Manager
HORN, General Counsel
KELLY, General Counsel

DISCOURSES

Harold C. Stassen, President
Alexander C. Haig, Jr., Vice President
Richard C. St. John, General Secretary
Carl G. Rosberg, General Counsel

Lewis D. Witter, Vice President
Theodore D. Vail, Vice President
Stephen A. Douglas, Vice President
John F. Kennedy, Vice President

Printed by the
Government of
the Commonwealth of
Massachusetts
New York 11.
by George H. Doran
Company, New York
Edition 1932.

Price 25 cents. Subscriptions, \$1.00
per volume. The yearly subscription
is \$3.00. Address all correspondence
to the Secretary of the Commonwealth,
Boston, Massachusetts. The Secretary
is authorized to accept the same.

WINTER, 1958-59

RELIGION IN LIFE

Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

A Christian Quarterly
OF OPINION AND DISCUSSION

VOLUME XXVIII

1958-59

EDITORIAL BOARD

EMORY STEVENS BUCKE, *Editor-in-Chief*
ERMINIE HUNTRESS LANTERO, *Assistant Editor*

JOHN BAILIE
ROBBINS W. BARSTOW
HAROLD A. BOSLEY
SAMUEL McC. CAVERT

GERALD R. CRAGG
NOLAN B. HARMON
STANLEY R. HOPPER
JOHN KNOX
KENNETH S. LATOURETTE

G. ASHTON OLDHAM
W. NORMAN PITTENGER
RUSSELL H. STAFFORD
ABDEL ROSS WENTZ

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Leslie F. Church
Joseph Haroutunian
Lynn Harold Hough
Walter G. Muelder

Harold C. Phillips
Alexander C. Purdy
Richard C. Raines
Carl C. Rasmussen

Leslie D. Weatherhead
Theodore O. Wedel
Luther A. Weigle
R. Frederick West

Microfilm Edition Available

RELIGION IN LIFE is now available in microfilm form for the benefit of libraries that may desire it. The publishers of RELIGION IN LIFE are co-operating with University Microfilms to make available to libraries microfilm rolls each of which contains a year's issues of the magazine.

Sales are restricted to those subscribing to the paper edition, and the microfilm roll is only distributed to purchasers at the end of the volume year (i.e., in the Fall). The microfilm copy is a positive, furnished on labeled plastic reels. Under this plan the library may scrap the paper copies after a few years and substitute the microfilm roll. Orders should be addressed to University Microfilms, 313 N. First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by the Abingdon Press at \$1.25 per copy. Subscription price, \$4.00 per year in the United States and possessions and Mexico; Canada, postage 18 cents per year additional; other foreign postage 30 cents per year additional.

Editorial office, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York 11, New York.
Publication office, 201 Eighth Avenue South, Nashville 3, Tennessee. Entered as Second Class Matter, August 26, 1942, at the post office in Nashville, Tennessee, under Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, Act of Oct. 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1923.

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY of opinion and discussion

VOL. XXVIII

Winter, 1958-59

No. 1

CONTENTS

Editorial	4
Theological Education in America	
1. The Situation in 1958.....	CHARLES L. TAYLOR 5
2. Training for the Parish Ministry.....	PAUL W. HOON 13
3. Training of Teachers of Religion for College and University.....	ROBERT MICHAELSEN 24
4. The Cosmos and the Ego.....	KEITH BRIDSTON 34
The Protestant Church-Related College in Tomorrow's Higher Education.....ASA S. KNOWLES 45	
The Historical Element in the Fourth Gospel.....	FREDERICK C. GRANT 56
Store-Front Religion.....	G. NORMAN EDDY 68
The Minister's Use of Literature.....	MARION C. ALLEN 86
The Called and the Chosen.....	NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE 98 <i>A Comparative Study of Edith Stein and Simone Weil</i>
The Paralysis of "Inability".....	A. APPLETON PACKARD 104
Should the Churches Publish Secular Journals?.....	ROLAND B. WOLSELEY 111
The Manual Acts in Holy Communion.....	JOHN C. BOWMER 119
Commentary.....	KARL W. GILLMEISTER CHARLES G. YOPST 127
Book Reviews and Notices.....	129

Editorial

MANY SIGNS POINT to a revival of concern for theological education. Most important, in the long run, is the enlarged responsibility which several denominations have begun to assume for their own schools. Another encouraging feature is the growing co-operation among the seminaries themselves through the American Association of Theological Schools. But the interest in theological education is no longer confined to an inner circle. The wider public has come to realize how deeply the future of the whole Christian movement depends on the quality of training of its leadership.

One indication of this is the fact that the Carnegie Corporation has recently made possible an intensive study of "The Advancement of Theological Education," and that the Sealantic Fund has made generous grants to several American seminaries. More recently, a group of missionary societies and the Sealantic Fund have joined in establishing an agency for raising the level of training in theological schools of the "younger churches" in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The problems faced in theological education today are complex and baffling. Perhaps the financial needs, great as they are, are the least difficult. At the center is the problem of the curriculum. Is it still to concentrate on the "classical" fields of biblical study, church history, theology, and preaching? Or shall it respond to the manifold claims of the "practical" fields—worship, Christian education, pastoral counseling, evangelism, ethics, religious drama, speech, church administration, the ecumenical movement? Can these new demands be met without hopelessly overloading the curriculum and losing all unity of direction?

Again, how far shall the seminary go in helping men to understand not only the Gospel and the Church, but also the world of today to which the Church communicates the Gospel? In our secularized society can one be an effective spiritual leader without knowing about the currents in modern literature, the language of the arts, the trends in philosophical thought, the insights of depth psychology, the social and economic forces that condition our culture?

Once again, is the seminary to focus entirely on its traditional function of training pastors for the local church? Or is it to accept responsibility also for more specialized types of service? If the former, who is to train teachers of religion for colleges and universities, directors of religious education, missionaries to foreign lands, chaplains for hospitals and the armed forces, executives of both denominational and ecumenical organizations?

The four contributions to the symposium in this issue stimulate serious reflection on such urgent questions as these.

S.M.C.

Theological Education in America

I. The Situation in 1958

CHARLES L. TAYLOR

ALMOST EXACTLY a half-century ago, in December 1908, Abraham Flexner began the intensive study of American medical education which, after the appearance of his rightly celebrated Bulletin Number Four,¹ resulted in the renovation not only of medical education, but of the whole profession in the United States and Canada. Medical schools which were operated for the benefit neither of the public nor of the students but to secure fees for the proprietors were closed. Education for this profession slowly but surely moved to university centers where the strictest standards of academic life were applicable. Students were selected with care and the requirements governing their previous education greatly strengthened. Clinical training became the rule. From the Johns Hopkins first and then from other excellent schools, doctors and teachers of medicine set a "style" of medical excellence which converted even the general public to a new level of expectation from the profession and brought untold blessing to millions of men and women.

As this was possible for the art of healing the human body, could there be a similar upsurge of improvement for the art of ministering to the human spirit? Fortunately the latter profession is not in the condition of the former of 1908. Within the past quarter century, thanks to co-operative effort, theological education has already become graduate education. Upwards of ninety per cent of those studying in theological schools have already earned college degrees. Whatever may be the egocentrism of theological students, professors, and administrators, the theological schools are not operated as money-making enterprises. Despite pockets of isolation relatively untouched by world wars and depressions, the eagerness of these and other centers to learn from each other, the spirit of self-searching and criticism, and the will to excellence are also impressive.

¹ Flexner, A.: *Medical Education in the United States and Canada*, New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910.

CHARLES L. TAYLOR, M.A., B.D., Th.D., formerly Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, is now Executive Director of the American Association of Theological Schools, Knott Building, Dayton 2, Ohio.

Theological librarians have taken gigantic strides forward with their department. Faculties are better trained—can we say “better”? At least they have enjoyed longer and stricter professional preparation, generally in more than one place with exposure to more than one point of view.

With the publication of the three volumes that sprang from the Niebuhr-Williams-Gustafson study, there have come clarification of the purpose of theological education, a right sense of its place (as of the ministry's) in historical perspectives, and an authoritative exposition of its present achievements and problems. The intent of this paper is not to summarize these studies but to explain a few of the basic needs which the past few years have accentuated if the improvement in this other dangerous profession is to resemble that of the doctors', and to indicate the kind of co-operative activity to which the studies have led, in which may be the seeds of another harvest.

I

Professor Whitehead once declared that “we cannot divide the seamless robe of learning.” It follows that preparation for the ministry is more than training in the customs of a profession; nothing less is called for than the education (*educare*, to nourish) or edification (in the strict sense) of a Christian to take his place of leadership in the body of Christ in such a way as to permit other Christians to make their contributions also to the building up of that body. But that body is set in a complex world. The interplay of gospel, church and cultural milieu profoundly affects the “style” of the minister. Hence, as the heads of Bible Colleges as well as theological schools are apparently coming to appreciate, no narrowly restricted subject matter is sufficient. No night school instruction in the lore of conducting public worship, no memorizing of a corpus of texts for use on all occasions, no short cuts to “effective” preaching or “successful” church administration take the place of a thorough knowledge of the environment in which the church seeks to minister today, the steps that led to the world's condition, the history of the church's relation to the forces which affected it and which it has affected through the centuries, and the gospel as understood in relation to the world of biblical times and from biblical times until now.

Moreover, increased understanding of the nature of man in the past half-century has brought radical changes in the concept of what is required to educate a minister. Not every school has consistently recognized that “in any individual the type of religious experience will depend upon the tradition prevalent in his social environment” (Temple), but psychology has become

of vast importance in the preparation of a ministry in which counseling plays such a major role. "To unleash into the world students with no basic insight into the subtle machinery of the ego, such as rationalization, defense, regression and other ills, is to deprive him not only of knowledge into his own problems of altruization but also of techniques with which to deal with an increasingly psychotic world" (Leonard Magruder).

The simple gospel is seen to be far less simple than some simple people have supposed. It would be possible to stress the value of other subjects for the preparation of ministers. But the point is clear: only when this preparation involves a very wide spectrum of divine and human affairs is it true education for the staggering task that lies before them. Can the theological school "get it all in" in the space of three years? No, no more than the new M.D. knows aught but a tiny fraction of medical information now available. But the theological school can develop methods and habits of inquiry, it can point to the sources of information to be tapped later, it can inculcate the will to seek truth and ensue it, and so produce lifelong learners. It can give the pattern to a character. Does detailed, accurate factual knowledge therefore become of little importance? No, for he who is careless about a fraction of truth will never be a man of full integrity. To have the right to claim all knowledge as his province with the zest and joy of the amateur who serves truth for no worldly gain, he must have attained professional competence in some small area of knowledge for which he assumes responsibility.

Just at this point, when theological education sees the extent of its concern and the necessity for proficiency in some corner of it, early marriage, increase in the size of theological schools (the number of students has increased from about 9,000 to nearly 25,000 in three decades), and especially financial problems threaten the community of scholarship and life which alone makes the preparation of the whole man in his widest relationship possible. It cannot be stressed too emphatically that the taking of occasional courses by men who to all intents and purposes are already *in* the ministry, serving churches which provide the chief focus of their attention, is not the same as the education of heart and mind and will that normally takes place when Christian students preparing *for* the ministry meet each other in classroom, at the dining room table, in the study, and on the playground for the greater part of a sixteen-hour day. To permit the student to be a student is among the first major needs of theological education in this decade.

II

Good men outside the church—and within it—are sorely tried by its legalisms, dogmatisms and the “trivial negativism of much of the church’s moralism.” A training school may tell its students about the latest tricks to spread “religion,” about pen knives with texts such as “God is love” or “Jesus saves” on each blade, or how to stop children from playing baseball on Sunday; but true education will insure the relevance and the importance of a conversion to a way of life that no tricks can bring about and will have a profound effect upon morals far more consequential than any moralism. At stake here is the whole Christian principle of responsible freedom. Is the purpose of the theological school to force students into a preconceived pattern of thought and practice, or to release vast possibilities in disciples who, following a Lord on a Cross, become ever more sensitive to the ills of the world and pioneers in their cure? Realistically speaking, there are still so-called centers of Christian learning in which conformity to fixed ideas and set codes are the rule, where any good from Nazareth is suspicious, where lack of loyalty to a person means intense loyalty to things and abstractions, where life’s emptiness, lostness and loneliness have their counterparts in rigid doctrinal and ethical demands. But while all this points to a fundamental sin of man that is not easily eradicated, the fresh winds of the unbound Spirit are blowing through not a few theological halls.

In terms of curricular revision, one of the significant needs in theological schools is for more courses in ethics, always intimately related to theology. Beyond this should not every professor in theological school be concerned for the ethical implications of his subject? To what is the gospel relevant? It is concerned not with a small Sunday-corner of life alone, but with the choices and decisions by which character is determined, and therefore has to do with such areas as the use of money and of speech and of food and of time. “Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven,” and although to exceed means first to include, the Christian church shows little surpassing, and sometimes hardly inclusion, of the best of the morals of the secular world about it.

In other words, while ministers do frequently develop a distinct “style” of life, it is not always such as to inspire others to the right use of money, speech, food and time. Theological education, to put this in another way, properly does not withdraw ministers from life, but sends them into it to demonstrate the gospel’s power. It is designed not to permit a group

to bask in special privilege, but to prepare this group to help each layman to exercise his ministry in the decisions that are really decisive. Beyond current theological education, therefore, is the picture of a great lay movement, and beyond that the prayer for the coming of the Kingdom in which God's will is done in every realm of man's activity. Is it necessary to dwell on the implications of this for the theological school? In a sense every course taught there should be relevant to the great social issues of our time, and every graduate be prepared to lead a colony of Christians who consistently bear witness to the more excellent way of life.

III

The time has come for each theological school to reappraise its purposes and the real needs—contrasted with imaginary needs—that call for its work. In the current revival of interest in the Christian church, each denomination justifies an expanding program: more members, more church buildings, more ministers, more theological schools, and more dollars for the program's support. It is worth asking whether this is good business for the denomination or for the glory of God, and whether the two aims may be in conflict. If the purpose of starting a new parish is to foster petty sectarian division, if it is to bring egotists together to promote a save-one's-own-soul type of religion, if it is to offer a cozy type of personal experience of God, if it is to produce an exclusive super-club or provide a place for the activities of Mark Twain's "best people of the worst sort," the bubble that we call the current religious revival must burst. No matter how successful the attempt to increase members of a sect, the only true aim is the conversion and nurture of Christians.

Some of the questions to be asked of a theological school, then, might run like this: Is it leading its students to an isolated position within the total Body of Christ? Is it careless of truth found by the most rigorous critical judgments and unbiased examination? Does it tend to insist on conformity to superstitious beliefs and irrational practices? Does it enforce its authority by fear? Does it insist on obedience to one set pattern which thrives on rivalry with other branches of the Christian church?

Of the theological students in this land, only about one in six attends an interdenominational school. That proportion may even diminish in the resurgence of denominational loyalties. At least we must reckon with the denominational fact. But also it is possible for each denominational school to heed the call from beyond its church's headquarters, the call to repentance for its part in "our unhappy division," the call to leave indefensible positions

that time has made uncouth, the call to a renewal and extension of the whole church that can only be possible through the unity to which God in Christ summons us, the call to learn from each other, with no inflation of self by comparison with other men, the call to leave ease and contentment with the present for effort in pioneering for a better day ahead.

There is no real need for five or six rival churches in a town of two thousand people. Particularly there is no need that the theological schools should admit, endure and in the end put their seal of approval on a multitude of ill-prepared men to serve such enterprises. What is needed is better equipment of persons to give better leadership in such towns toward a more Christian community, and, as a part of this, theological faculties who see their task in the light of the ecumenical imperatives of the last half-century in relation both to the gospel and to nineteen hundred years of Christian history.

IV

Comprehensive education, ethical education, ecumenical education—how is this to be achieved? There is no one prescription to be administered to all the six-score theological schools. But there is growing certainty about a number of ingredients that belong in a steady healthy diet for the churches. The theological schools must become centers of learning summoning all Christian people to serve the Lord better with all their minds. The faculties of these schools must be thoroughly equipped for their positions and adequately supported in them. The professors must be given opportunity through writing and speaking to educate not only a group of students but through them and beyond them the whole church. Isolation must be overcome, but proper withdrawal from restless coming and going also provided. Standards must be recognized and goals far beyond these standards constantly kept in view: standards of prior preparation for theological students, standards of faculty load and responsibility, standards for libraries and finances, standards of sabbatical leaves and academic freedom.

Since 1918 the theological schools and colleges of the United States and Canada have been meeting regularly to consider such and many more matters pertaining to their common life. In 1936 they established an association, in which the chief business was to encourage the schools to meet accepted norms in such a measure as to be called accredited by this same association. But two decades later they have seen many other tasks and embarked on a greatly expanded plan of co-operative effort.

For the students: rigorous admissions standards, supported by a widely circulated statement of advice as to pre-seminary studies.

For the students: a Senior Honors Scholarship program, to permit the seniors in accredited schools to leave their filling stations and grocery stores, yes, and the demands of a parish that all too often tends to exploit the embryonic minister, in order to make ready better for the lifelong ministry as they bear witness to the sacred calling of student.

For the graduate students: a new statement of standards for the doctorate, which shall protect them from a cheap degree, and with which is linked an extensive program of fellowships that prospective theological teachers may be able to carry through their studies and the schools be adequately staffed.

For the graduates: various experiments in ongoing education, so far in summer institutes, but with the goal of all-year-round centers in which ministers can find refreshment.

For the professors: faculty fellowships which, in conjunction with sabbatical leaves, permit them to go abroad or otherwise to refill the dry wells and to taste the waters of other springs.

For the professors: opportunities to meet in regional conferences, sometimes with men in the same field, that their horizons may be widened and their teaching revivified.

For the schools: visits from teams of advisors, whose careful studies and reports are designed to help each school to make increased use of its opportunities and to strengthen its performance.

For the schools: extensive materials pertaining to the building up of their libraries.

For the schools: self-study guides and various other literature designed to suggest possibilities for improvement, experiment, co-operation and better utilization of resources.

The financial burden upon theological education has increased enormously even within the past three years. In 1954-55, in 26 "typical" schools, the average educational cost per student was \$675, in 1956-57, in 117 schools, \$1,243. While such figures must not be given more weight than they legitimately bear, they confirm a widespread realization that the schools need more resources. With this the conviction has grown that they must work together to tell the churches and the public of their need, and that in order to attract assistance on a large scale they must give evidence, as the medical profession did, that their enterprise as a whole is sound.

Rigorous self-criticism, therefore, is the order of the day. A century and a quarter ago Dr. Daniel Drake, in commenting on the low standards of the medical profession, blamed this condition on the public. "Some

persons are too dull to discriminate among the members of the profession, others allow themselves to be captivated by pleasant manners, and not a few call for cheap doctoring, all of which tend to elevate false pretensions and depress real merit." But three quarters of a century later the doctors did not wait for the public to change its ways. They improved the medical schools. Thus they led the public to a new standard.

It will not be the public that sees first the dependence of the welfare of the land upon its churches, the dependence of the churches upon their leaders, and the dependence of the leaders upon their training. It will not be the public, nor even the rank and file of the churches, that realizes how the Christian movement survived the first few centuries when its position in the Roman Empire was so precarious, by *out-thinking* its rivals, furnishing satisfaction for the intellect as well as the emotions of men. But it is within the power of each school to be so transparently clear in its purposes, so firm in the maintenance of its standards, so eager to learn from others and to improve, so sensitive to the movements of our time, so imaginative in response to changing needs, that the churches and the wider community may be drawn to more worthy ambassadors for Christ and make provision for their successors.

2. Training for the Parish Ministry

PAUL W. HOON

RECENTLY PUBLISHED INQUIRIES into theological education in America hold many portents for the life of the Church, but none more significant than for the parish ministry. If the figure of the Church Militant allows one to think of the seminaries as war colleges of the Church, and of the parish minister as the obscure, often unheroic but indispensable infantryman slugging it out with the enemy on the front line, then the character of his preparation and his adequacy for combat become of first importance. Indeed many people would contend that while all the forces of the Church Militant clearly have their place in God's will for his people, the parish minister is strategically *the soldier par eminence*; and recent publications defining the over-all strategy of his holy warfare,¹ reviewing his military history² and analyzing the status of his training,³ should accordingly command the attention of thoughtful Christians.

I

First, some facts⁴: The number of students enrolled in Protestant seminaries has roughly tripled in the past generation, with approximately 25,000 students enrolled in about 180 seminaries in the United States and Canada in 1954 as compared with approximately 161 similar schools in 1934. Not less than 80 per cent of these students are college graduates (largely of church-controlled or church-affiliated colleges), as compared with about 50 per cent in 1930. The rate of increased seminary enrollment has not kept pace with the rate of growth in college and graduate school enrollment generally, but it has exceeded the rate of growth of Protestant church membership; the present ratio is about one theological student to 2,375 church members. (The ratio of women students has generally co-

¹ Niebuhr, H. R., *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry: Reflections on the Aims of Theological Education*, Harper & Brothers, 1956.

² Niebuhr, H. R., Williams, D. D., Editors, *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives*, Harper & Brothers, 1956.

³ Niebuhr, H. R., Williams, D. D., Gustafson, J. M., *The Advancement of Theological Education*, Harper & Brothers, 1957.

⁴ These data are assembled from *The Advancement of Theological Education*.

PAUL W. HOON, Ph.D., S.T.D., is Henry Sloane Coffin Professor of Pastoral Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York City, and President of the American Association of Seminary Professors in the Practical Fields.

incided with the increase of over-all seminary enrollment; the enrollment of Negro theological students has fallen behind). Whereas 15 per cent of students enrolled in 1935-45 were married, today from 30 per cent to 60 per cent are married—the average is perhaps 50 per cent. It would appear that most students are not overworked, academically speaking, and while opinions differ, the stability and normality of family life are generally judged to be an asset in their theological education. About 85 per cent to 90 per cent of parish ministers today are trained in denominational seminaries. Greater emphasis is generally being placed on "selective recruiting" of students, with concern for quality rather than mere numbers, evident particularly in more rigorous testing procedures⁵; as one seminary dean has plainly said, "seminaries are screening institutions as well as training centers."

The average seminary in 1955 had approximately 165 students, between nine and ten full-time and three to four part-time faculty members, the average faculty-student ratio (an important index) being 17 to 1 and 12.2 to 1, respectively. The average weekly teaching load of instructors was nine to ten classroom hours. On the whole, possession of earned academic degrees would indicate that seminary teachers today are better prepared academically than a generation ago, and a projection from incomplete data indicates that some 88 per cent of faculty members are ordained and that 77 per cent have had some parish experience. On the other hand, because of complex and mounting pressures (administrative, denominational, curricular, and not least financial—the average *full* professor's salary [\$6,700] in 1954 was equal in terms of 1939 purchasing power to \$3,620), the quality of instruction has probably declined. The "key problem" in theological education today is the enlistment and maintenance of an able corps of teachers.

II

The educational enterprise within which these facts find their meaning is being conducted today amidst an interplay of influences which require brief identification and appraisal if the task of preparing men for the parish ministry is to be comprehended in its full scope and complexity. These influences criss-cross one another—historically, culturally, theologically, ecclesiastically, and they do not make the theological educator's lot always a happy one. One of the foremost, too often ignored, is the *historical* legacy bequeathed to seminaries from the revivalism and pietism of nineteenth-

⁵ Cf. Froyd, Milton C., "Pre-Testing for the Ministry," in *The Christian Century*, June 27, 1956.

century America, with its strong emphasis on religion as experience and its corresponding disinterest in theological discipline as an end in itself. Mingled in with this legacy of course are the Reformed and Puritan traditions with their theological robustness and their ideal of a "learned ministry," but structuring it also are the patterns of pluralistic denominationalism with its pragmatic orientation, its tendency toward massive institutionalism, and its close—if not coercive—claim upon the seminaries.

Now the claim of the denominations upon the seminaries has always been one of the "givens" of education for the parish ministry, and one would not necessarily wish it otherwise. If the Church, theologically speaking, is constitutive of the ministry rather than *vice versa*, it certainly, through the denominations, has the right also to be constitutive of the seminaries. Historically the vast majority if not all the seminaries were founded by church denominations, and most presidents and deans, even of interdenominational schools, would say that their main task is to prepare men for parish churches. But this legacy is not all an unmixed blessing, especially at a time when many forms of Protestantism are emerging out of revivalism and pietism into a certain maturity and are growing impatient with stereotypes of parish ministry inherited from the past, when the ecumenical vision is displacing the narrower vision of denominationalism, and when theological education is being challenged to match the best of secular education. The seminaries, in other words, find themselves in a tension that on the whole is a difficult if a healthy one, between the claims of the past on the one hand, and the realities of the present and the vision of the future on the other.

Another cluster of influences inheres in the *social* and *cultural* situation. Some social facts of life, for one thing, say something to theological educators: the swiftly growing numbers of churches to be manned resulting from increased population, from the growth of Protestant church membership in part due to the "religious revival," from the mobility of the American people with the growth of suburbia, and from the retirement of ministers at an earlier age made possible by Social Security. In addition to these is the competition for trained leaders as chaplains for the armed forces, colleges, hospitals, prisons; the need for teachers of religion in colleges and universities; the need for directors of religious education and church musicians; the claims of the missions fields; the growing need for denominational executives, religious journalists and competent people in religious radio and television. Probably almost as large a percentage of theological graduates *end up* in the parish ministry as in the past, but the need for diverse types

of ministry in our culture today and the corresponding diversity of instruction and curriculum that must be provided to meet it, are something to be reckoned with.

But even within the distinctive domain of training for the parish ministry, the significance of the cultural and social situation must be faced. How far seminaries should go in taking their educational directives from the cultural context in which the churches find themselves is a moot and crucial question which will be discussed later in this paper—but at the minimum the seminaries must bring a certain realism in gearing their education to the churches as they presently are. Now obviously churches vary greatly, but on the whole the parish church in America has by no means always discriminated wisely between responsibilities for ministry that properly and improperly belong to it, in part because it has too uncritically permitted its surrounding culture to define its purpose, in part because it has lacked a theological understanding of its nature and mission that alone would make sound decision possible, and in part because it has surrendered too easily to denominational managerialism which in turn is often culturally conditioned. Its “program”—to use the word with which it characteristically describes the complex of its organized ministries—is frequently an elaborate one, often fostered by denominational pressures from above as well as by cultural and community pressures from without. (One has only to read the denominational “plan books” showered upon the parish minister, accompanied by hints, persuasion and sometimes threats, to see what institutional-cultural Protestantism thinks a local church ought ideally to be. This situation, however, is not always necessarily bad; congregations and pastors frequently need to be prodded out of their sloth.) The challenge which the present realities of parish life offer to the inherent conservatism of the seminaries is obvious: less antiquated and more specialized training for new forms of parish life, an enlarged range of practical courses to meet changing needs in pastoral work, the establishment of new departments (for example, church and community, pastoral psychology), the redistribution of points required for graduation, even fundamental educational policy.

A significant illustration of the impact of cultural forces upon training for the parish ministry is found in Richard Niebuhr's “emerging new conception of the ministry,” the minister as “pastoral director,” a conception having authentic biblical roots, latent and at times explicit in Christian tradition, but elicited and shaped not least by the contemporary cultural and ecclesiastical situation. The concept of the “pastoral director” is offered as the basic category within which the traditional offices of ministry—the

minister as preacher, priest, pastor, teacher—are to be gathered up and redefined, and the parish ministry is to be first thought of as administering, as ". . . building or 'edifying' the church," as bringing into being ". . . a people of God who as a church will serve the purpose of the Church in the local community and the world."⁶ Now this concept of the "pastoral director" clearly needs to be understood with theological vigilance and historical perspective lest it pervert authentic ministry into managerial manipulation, but its mirrorlike reflection of the nature of ministry in the churches today, its relevance to the realities of parish life and its implications for seminary training cannot be denied. It is significant that this concept answers to the commonest criticism seminary graduates make of their seminary training after they have landed in their churches—the failure to teach them how to administer a church as Church.

But other forces must also be reckoned with. The tide of secularism, especially as it affects public school education, combined with the failure of the churches to develop strong ministries of Christian education, are forcing the churches to improve their teaching of the Christian faith. An untoward generation all too eager to hear corrupt gospels encouraging the comfortable cleavage between pietism and culture that so long has been the bane of Protestantism, desperately needs effective preaching of the offense and salvation of the Gospel in its fullness, in turn requiring disciplined knowledge of the Bible and its theology, a lived experience of its message, and greater skills in communication. Again, the low estate of public worship in many churches evident in the virtual abandonment of Holy Communion as part of the classic norm of Protestant worship, the substitution of arty "enrichment" for theological integrity in liturgy and architecture, indifference to valid liturgical tradition—all these plus the illiteracy of multitudes of people in the meaning and method of Christian prayer and their corruption with hit-parade piety and packaged spiritual pabulum for "today"—these say much about the training of the minister as priest.

Above all, perhaps, loom the individual and collective sicknesses in the souls and bodies of men today, and the importance of the healing the church must bring through charismatic and scientific therapies. Both "the sciences of God" and "the sciences of man" must be part of the pastor's education, and in his care of souls he cannot be permitted to ignore the techniques of psychology and psychiatry any more than he can be left uninstructed in the resources of healing of the Gospel. Thus minimal instruc-

⁶ *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry*, p. 82.

tion in pastoral psychology is required in virtually all curricula, and opportunities for clinical training are pressed upon the students in the majority of schools. (In 1955 approximately sixty-eight seminaries accredited by or affiliated with the American Association of Theological Schools were related to some kind of clinical training program, as compared with thirteen seminaries in 1943.)

But seminaries are not only affected by influences from without; they themselves also generate in greater or lesser degree *forces from within*. One thinks immediately of the theological revival, partly of foreign import and partly domestic made, largely fostered by theological scholars and accompanied by a recovery of the classic theological disciplines—biblical studies, church history, systematic theology, philosophy of religion, history of doctrine, and derivatively Christian ethics, liturgy. Again, the ecumenical movement affects though it hardly as yet penetrates very deeply a student's training for the parish ministry. One also finds in certain seminaries an effort to relate Christian faith to contemporary culture especially in its artistic forms, the theatre, architecture,¹ literature, painting. There is further the ongoing task of comparative study of Christianity *vis a vis* other religions, especially in seminaries connected with university communities. Now it is oversimple to ascribe the genesis of these influences to the seminaries alone, but the degree to which this may be the case constitutes something of a witness to the vitality of the stream of Christian faith of which the seminaries, despite their tendency toward what has been called "a congenital conservatism," are blessedly victims.

It is clear from this all too summary identification of influences affecting the seminaries, that the task of training men for the parish ministry is becoming less and less manageable; and one is not surprised that a sense of strain characterizes the seminaries, evident in overloading of the curriculum, lack of integration in the course of study, mounting pressures upon the student, enlargement of faculties with more specialized departments. Some seminaries are attempting to meet the situation by extending the length of study from three to four years, adding an "internship" year taken either between the second and third or after the fourth year. Experience with the intern year yields arguments pro and con, but it would seem to be a promising development if—and this is an important "if"—adequate staffs for administration and supervision can be provided. Another suggestion is the establishment of post-B.D. summer school programs with particular emphasis on practical studies such as religious education, pastoral care, parish administration, etc. It is held that such a proposal would succeed in cor-

relating parish experience with theological theory, and would permit specialization of a healthy sort in a way hardly possible prior to actual engagement in definite tasks. A quite strong case can be made for this proposal on both practical and pedagogical grounds. But whether the seminaries and denominations can bring the necessary co-operation, whether pastors already located in parishes can afford the time and expense, above all whether it is educationally desirable to separate the so-called "content" and "practical" fields as the authors of this proposal tend to imply, are difficult problems yet to be solved.

III

As one surveys in broad prospect the data provided by the studies previously referred to, one finds a number of concerns emerging within the seminaries which bear with particular significance upon the training of men for the parish ministry, only three of which, however, can be mentioned within the concluding limits of this paper. Common to them all is the seminaries' "rigorous self-criticism" which Dean Taylor rightly declares to be "the order of the day," and implicit in the seminaries' self-criticism is a sharper, more troubled understanding of the perplexities, the perils and the possibilities of the pastoral ministry in today's world, and of the corresponding effort the seminaries must make to prepare men adequately for them. The sense of frustration the seminaries often express, in other words, difficult as it is to live with, is basically a healthy thing. If the pastor's task is rightly a gloriously impossible one and should be viewed as such—as many of us would contend—then the seminaries' task of preparation is also impossible, and perhaps theological education, like the Christian, is justified by grace not by works lest any man should boast! It is heartening that one does not find much boasting among the more sensitive theological educators; one finds rather sober, honest, steady-eyed concern.

One widespread concern is how to live and work within the tension between what may be somewhat arbitrarily called tradition and empiricism. Other categories and terms could be chosen to define and elucidate this tension: the relation of logic-centered or classical to operation-centered or pragmatic disciplines, *episteme* in relation to *tekne*, theological or normative concepts of ministry in contrast to functional, and so forth. To illustrate: a professor of Christian education has wisely remarked, "The nature of the Church determines the nurture of the Church." How much insight is gathered up in those words, and how widely does the parish ministry in its teaching function need the corrective of traditional theological discipline! But must not one also go on to add: "The experience of nurturing churches yields

meaning for the nature of the Church"? This is to say, both tradition and experience are sources of education, and as it is with the minister as teacher, so it is with his training as administrator, pastor, preacher. Practical training in pastoral counseling, for example, is not to be understood as only the acquiring of skills or as only the implementation of a theology previously passed out to the student; it is itself a means of apprehending as well as expressing classical theology, and it contributes to as well as draws on knowledge of historical Christian faith.

Now the importance of sustaining the dialogical relation between tradition and empiricism in training for the parish ministry can hardly be overestimated, not only because it is pedagogically sound but above all because it can prepare the future minister as hardly anything else can, to live with and resolve the characteristic modern dilemmas in which he will inevitably find himself, most notably the dilemma which compels him to spend most time and energy in parish administration which, however, he feels most distaste for and least competent at.⁷ This dilemma will begin to be overcome only by exposing the future pastor in his seminary training to both tradition and experience in such a way as to forge a theological temper of mind that will enable him to translate the "raw stuff" of parish life theologically, and to apprehend theological meaning from his total ministry. Surely something is gravely wrong with the pastor and his training if the administration of a parish is not theologically exciting, and if, as commonly reported, his relations with his laymen are more of a source of irritation than a means of grace.

It may be ventured that this particular dilemma has come about largely because the seminaries have trained their students too long on the false assumption that theology and experience are something apart, and professors of practical theology are hardly less to blame than their opposite numbers in the so-called "content" fields. Fundamental educational policy of course is also involved here, but professorial attitudes and professorial conceptions of the relation between tradition and empiricism are perhaps even more involved. One investigator reports that out of several hundred parish pastors interviewed, 60 per cent declared that the most influential people in their lives were their seminary professors. How much praise and how much blame do the good professors bear in relation to the dilemmas in which today's parish ministers find themselves?

Seminaries are intensely concerned, further, to educate the student as

⁷ Cf. Blizzard, Samuel W., "The Minister's Dilemma," in *The Christian Century*, April 25, 1956, Vol. 73, No. 17.

a whole person in such a way that he will continue to grow into emotional, intellectual, theological and spiritual maturity. These different aspects of maturity can be separated of course only for purposes of analysis, not only because the student is a whole man but also because of the distinctively existential character of seminary training which must cut down into the whole man. Seminary communities are not merely "gnostic enterprises," in the words of one theological educator! It is doubtless appropriate to define a theological school as "the intellectual center" of the Church's life where the mind thinks toward God and neighbor in love, but beside such a cerebral approach must be set such ventral words as these from a seminary senior: "I knew that in the course of three years I would change my mind about some things and that I would probably have a crisis or two . . . I knew my idea of ministry was pretty simple and that it would hurt in an interior way to reorganize my vocational goal." And he was not wrong. He adds: "*It hurt, it hurts, and it will hurt.*" The "hurt" often goes so deep that emotional disabilities are uncovered; sometimes these are repressed, only storing up future trouble, at other times faced and worked through. In any case, concern for a student's emotional health must loom largely in training for the parish ministry, for students are prospective pastors, one must never forget, who will be sources of sickness or health to multitudes of people for many years to come.

But intellectual, theological and spiritual maturity are also part of the seminaries' concern, some educators would say the main concern; and only within this perspective can many of the criticisms of seminary training be reliably appraised. It is often said, for example, that seminaries are becoming too much schools for graduate study and not sticking to their main task of producing preachers; that specialization is too much the vogue and that what we need is well-rounded men; that responsibilities to the denominations to supply their churches are taken too lightly; that more vocational training with more practical instruction is needed, and so forth. These comments will perhaps fall into their proper place if it be granted that a seminary can hardly do more for a man than to inspire him to become a constantly maturing person in the life of the mind, a "self-educating person" whose theological education will never be completed until he dies, and hopefully not even then! At stake here is the crucial distinction between short-range and long-range goals of theological education, and the larger vision of the type of minister the church and the world today most fundamentally need.

The fact is that on the whole, with qualifications, the ministry today

is not vocationally incompetent; it is clearly, however, a "perplexed profession," and the two are not unrelated. It is of great significance that it is precisely the men who up until now have been mainly trained vocationally who are the most perplexed about themselves and their mission, and the inference appears to be that when a seminary only trains a man for a vocational goal, e.g., "to serve the local church," and fails to develop the man himself into a maturing theological pastor able to set changing problems as they arise within the broader theological vision of the purpose of the church and the ministry, it is begetting a profession which sooner or later inevitably becomes "perplexed." The paradox is that in a sense the seminaries end up best serving the denominations and the churches by not serving them too directly, by refusing to supply them with the vocationally competent ministers they desire, tailored to the churches' specifications. It is not only that the churches themselves often corruptly conceive their own nature and are untrustworthy in the definition of the ministry they lay down. It is also that the future minister will need every bit of theological intestinal fortitude he can muster to roll with the punches and withstand the cultural and ecclesiastical conditioning to which he will be exposed over a lifetime. "The success . . . of a church," writes Daniel Jenkins, is to be ". . . estimated by its ability to discern and obey the will of God for its life in its own place . . ." ⁸ This kind of "success" is not always the kind of success churches and denominations really want, and its achievement takes something more than the ability to integrate audio-visual aids into the youth program. It requires before anything else a maturing vision of man's life before God and under God, which in turn comes only from strenuous, intensive, theological inquiry prolonged over a lifetime. Mature men with theological vision *plus* vocational skills are our first need, and the seminaries increasingly understand that. In an eloquent sentence of a distinguished seminary president: "Christian ministers need to be trained today who shall live with a constant sense of beyondness in their hearts and in their eyes."⁹

A third concern is closely linked with the seminaries' "rigorous self-criticism" previously mentioned. Where are theological education in general and training for the parish ministry in particular to look for their ultimate directives? Various phrases commonly heard suggest this concern: the search for "theological integrity," "internal consistency," "a sense of direction,"

⁸ *The Protestant Ministry*, Faber and Faber, 1958, p. 38.

⁹ Mackay, John A., "The Finality of Theological Education," *The Seventeenth Biennial Meeting of the American Association of Theological Schools*, June, 1950, Bulletin 19, p. 82.

"a theology of theological education." One body of opinion replies, "Look to the churches," and certainly a responsible appraisal of the immediate and ultimate needs of the churches can furnish, up to a point, a frame of reference within which training for the parish ministry can purposefully be carried on. More than one seminary curriculum, for example, has been rather successfully constructed by reference to the tasks the parish minister ends up doing. Again, the needs of the contemporary world, surveyed in breadth and analyzed in depth, are clearly part of the answer; and as previously noted, seminaries have not been unaware of the necessity of engaging in "the dialogue between the sacred and the secular," and of equipping students to communicate the Gospel to culture with realism and with power. Further, the seminaries themselves do not toil in unmitigated darkness! Faculties, deans, presidents, even directors, have been not unknown to define with considerable insight and precision the directives under which they operate!

But helpful as these are, they do not ultimately suffice. Still broader perspectives are needed. And it is here that the seminaries are now realizing their great debt to the men of scholarly vision, who, in the volumes recently published, have summoned the seminaries to envision anew the larger perspectives in which their work is to be carried on. History is one such perspective. Doctrines of the church and the ministry, and especially of the coming great ecumenical church, are another; such a statement, for example, as "the life of the whole Church should become the context of all theological studies,"¹⁰ can revolutionize training for the parish ministry. But beyond even these is the ultimate perspective, the Gospel itself as beheld through both the eyes of faith and the eyes of history. In the last analysis, the seminaries will find their directives in fidelity to One whom they with all Christendom confess to be Lord, and whose living mind they will pray to rule their endeavor.

¹⁰ *The Advancement of Theological Education*, p. 89.

3. *Training of Teachers of Religion for College and University*

ROBERT MICHAELSEN

IN MY MORE CYNICAL moments I am inclined to feel that the common attitude in religious circles toward teaching religion in college might best be summarized in the phrase, "If you can't preach, teach," or, possibly even more aptly, "If you can't teach in a seminary, then teach in college." To succumb to this kind of cynicism would be to cast aspersions on too many devoted teachers of religion in American colleges and universities. However, it is no more than realism to recognize that the training of teachers of religion for college and university lurks somewhere in a limbo between the training of men for the parish ministry and the training of men who will train men for the parish ministry. Most advanced education in religion is carried on in a seminary-related or oriented institution where the primary work is to prepare men for the pastoral ministry or for teaching in seminary. This clearly offers many advantages, the chief being that the student can be grounded intensively in the theological disciplines and oriented intellectually in the religion of his own persuasion. However, this alone is hardly enough to prepare a man to do well as a teacher in a college or university situation.

I

Suppose we begin by dreaming dreams of the ideal preparation of the ideal teacher of religion. Then we can turn to what is available and conclude by making some suggestions for improvements in the present programs.

We would hope to find in our man certain intangibles of personality which mark him as being big with potential for teaching—what we sometimes call a "sense of vocation," as well as some ability to communicate to the illiterate and some understanding of the nature of the educational process. Turning to his preparation, we would ask that, in spatial terms, it be both broad and deep. We would expect our candidate to be well grounded in the field of religion: specifically, to have a nodding acquaintance with the history and literature of the major religions of the world, more than a slight acquaintance with a major religion other than Judaism or Christianity, and

ROBERT MICHAELSEN, B.D., Ph.D., D.D., is Professor and Administrative Director of the School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

to be on more intimate terms with the history and literature of Judaism and Christianity—including the development and thought of post-biblical Judaism and the major branches of Christianity. We would also hope that our ideal teacher would know something about the approaches to religion and the claims about religion made by such academic disciplines as anthropology, sociology, psychology, and philosophy; and that he would be aware of the role of religion in the culture and life of a particular people.

In addition to these desirables, it would greatly enhance our teacher's effectiveness in the college or university community if he had a background and interest in some of the following fields: art, philosophy, literature, classics and the social sciences.

Most of what has been suggested thus far relates only to the base of the pyramid of learning. The way to the apex would consist of considerable exposure to the discipline of theology, both in its historical and systematic aspects, and finally a degree of specialized training issuing in competence in some aspect of one of the theological disciplines or a related area. And lest we imply that all we are seeking is a teacher—though that is certainly something—we would hope that this specialization would develop an ability to do the type of independent and creative research which all graduate institutions speak of in connection with their Ph.D. degrees.

As a final touch we might hope that our teacher would develop some ideas and convictions about the role of religion as a discipline in the undergraduate curriculum, and that he might gain some insight into such mundane matters as the workings of a college or university and the responsibilities of a faculty member.

At this point one might conclude that we are seeking nothing less than St. Thomas Aquinas in gray flannels. If this ideal is high, then there can be little harm in striving after it.

II

There are approximately twenty institutions where this type of individual might be prepared. In preparing for this article, information about graduate programs in religion was sought from approximately a dozen of these, chiefly from the institutions offering the Ph.D. degree.

Most of these graduate programs in religion are offered by a seminary or under a program which is operated by a university graduate school but heavily dependent upon the resources of a seminary. Graduate faculties in religion generally consist of seminary professors—men, in other words, whose primary concern is the preparation of men for the pastoral ministry

or for seminary teaching. This type of graduate education is generally conceived of as an extension of seminary education. Nearly all institutions granting doctorates in religion require or strongly recommend a B.D. degree or its equivalent and in most instances the graduate work offered consists of a more intensive dosage of the same thing that is administered at the B.D. level.

There are some exceptions to the above generalizations. A number of institutions which train teachers of religion offer two doctoral degrees, such as the Th.D., which is administered and granted by the seminary, and the Ph.D., which is guided by a committee or committees made up of members of the seminary faculty and the graduate faculty of the university. Generally the Th.D. degree is conceived of as being more highly specialized than the Ph.D., and thus supposedly more adequate for the man who is preparing to teach in a seminary; whereas the Ph.D. is broader in orientation and, theoretically at least, more suitable to the man whose goal is college or university teaching. Notable examples where this type of division is found are Harvard, where the Th.D. is offered by the seminary and the Ph.D. in the History and Philosophy of Religion is granted by the graduate school, and Union-Columbia, where a somewhat similar practice is followed, the Ph.D. program being under the guidance of a committee representing several departments of Columbia University.

In the Yale Divinity School curriculum, a candidate for the B.D. degree who wishes to prepare to teach may select as his vocational area "teaching and research in religion." If he does so he is not required to take some of the homiletical and practical courses required of men preparing for the parish ministry, and he is required to achieve a reading knowledge of either French or German by the beginning of his third year.

Another and more obvious exception to the above generalization is afforded by Princeton University's recently instituted graduate program in religion. At Princeton a man with a B.A. degree with a major in religion may be admitted directly to the Ph.D. program. The B.D. is not required and the graduate program is conceived of more as an extension of the undergraduate program than as an extension of the B.D. curriculum.¹

Graduate programs in religion require varying degrees of breadth as background in the field. The Union-Columbia program cuts across the usual

¹ Professor George Thomas, Chairman of the Department of Religion at Princeton, reports that thus far very few men with only the B.A. degree have applied for graduate study in religion at Princeton. Furthermore, he indicates, there are so few really good departments of religion where a man may receive a strong undergraduate major that the Princeton department has felt compelled in one or two cases to recommend that a man with only a B.A. degree spend a year in a seminary taking basic courses in the theological disciplines in order to prepare himself better for graduate work.

departmental lines. Also, one of the requirements for matriculation is "a general knowledge of the history and philosophy of religion." At Harvard every candidate is expected to show proficiency in three areas: (1) the contents and literary history of the Bible; (2) the history of one religion other than Judaism and Christianity; and (3) the philosophy of religion and specifically metaphysics, theory of knowledge, and ethics.

The program under the Federated Theological Faculty at the University of Chicago requires a student to pass satisfactory examinations in six of eight sequences representing the following areas: Bible, Christian Theology, Ethics and Society, History of Christianity, History of Religions, Religion and Art, and Religion and Personality.

The Princeton program is deliberately designed to provide breadth. All candidates are required to take general examinations in Biblical Literature, Christian History and Thought, and the History and Philosophy of Religion. It is recommended that each student take at least two graduate courses in Biblical Literature, three in Christian History and Thought, and two in the History and Philosophy of Religion. In addition to this, students are required to take at least two graduate courses in another department related to the field in which they are specializing. In a further attempt to broaden graduate study, Princeton endeavors to expose its graduate students to articulate representatives of other faiths than Protestant Christianity.

At the writer's own institution, the School of Religion at the State University of Iowa, where graduate study is carried on under an inter-religious faculty, candidates for the Ph.D. degree are required to be well grounded in the history and thought of Judaism, Catholicism and Protestantism, and in a minor field related to the area of their specialization.

Areas of specialization open to the graduate student of religion are commonly known. These typically include Old and New Testament, Church History, History of Religions or Comparative Religion, Historical or Systematic Theology, Philosophical Theology, Ethics, The Study of Society, and Religion and Personality or the Psychology of Religion. The Federated Theological Faculty at the University of Chicago offers the intriguing area of Religion and Art as another possibility for specialized study.

The graduate schools in religion offer very little by way of formal assistance in such subjects as the History and Philosophy of Education, the function of the college and the university, the role of religion in higher education, and the nature of the learning process. Boston University School of Theology expresses the desire to develop a course in teaching methods for doctoral candidates. The hope is that the graduate school at Boston

University will develop this type of course for students in all graduate areas.

Various forms of teaching assistantships afford graduate students practical experience. Correspondence from Boston points out that "in several departments, doctoral candidates serve as readers, conduct discussion sections of core courses, and take occasional lecture sessions. All of these are in close collaboration with faculty members. . . ." This same sort of modified apprenticeship is undoubtedly practiced at many institutions. Indeed, recently, and largely as a result of the study of theological education made under the direction of Professor H. Richard Niebuhr, certain foundations have become interested in making available funds which might be used to employ advanced graduate students in religion as teaching assistants. Practical experience of this type is most likely to involve the teaching of students preparing for the B.D. degree rather than undergraduates.

At Yale a B.D. candidate who expects to pursue graduate study is required to take a minimum of three semester hours of work in the field of Religion in Higher Education. Courses available have included American Higher Education and Religion, Philosophies of Higher Education, and the Teaching of Religion to Undergraduates. Professor Clarence Shedd, who pioneered at Yale in developing the program in Religion in Higher Education, is now helping to develop a similar program at the Pacific School of Religion.

III

What suggestions might we make for the modification and improvement of the training of teachers in religion for colleges and universities? What follows stems mostly out of my own experience as a teacher of religion in a university and as one charged with the responsibility of employing teachers in religion. These suggestions have been both modified and reinforced by conversations and correspondence with other individuals who have had teaching experience in this field.²

The suggestions given here are naturally meant to be of a constructive nature. I think that most of us who have completed doctoral work in religion within the last ten to fifteen years are quite grateful for the type of training and education we received. Generally we are inclined to feel that this training has served us well in our teaching. However, we are not entirely prepared to say that there is no room for improvement.

² In preparing for this article letters were sent to twenty-seven men who are teaching religion and who are from two to ten years out of the seminary or university from which they took their graduate work. A selected list was secured from the National Council on Religion in Higher Education. The letter asked these men to give (1) opinions about the adequacy of their own preparation; and (2) suggestions as to ways in which advanced education in religion might be modified so as to prepare men better for teaching in college or university.

The suggestions I have to make come under such headings as broader background in the field of religion, more exposure to "secular" disciplines and thought, and a greater effort to orient men toward teaching and toward the college and university community. A number of teachers in the field have expressed concern at not being required to become more fully acquainted with the history of religions and even more specifically with post-Biblical Judaism and Roman Catholicism since the Reformation. Another concern is for greater exposure to such disciplines as philosophy, literature and the social sciences. Most of the men with whom I have talked or corresponded feel that this should take place wherever possible within the "secular" atmosphere of the disciplines and not just in special courses offered by members of the seminary faculty.

One correspondent, for example, indicated that at the institution where he took his graduate work it was apparently assumed that such movements as logical empiricism and such subjects as the relations between science and religion were of little or no importance to the teacher of religion. He feels that his seminary and graduate school were dominated by what he calls a "party line" which left him in "blissful ignorance of several important developments and significant current trends in [his] field." A person trained in this type of atmosphere may find himself quite unprepared to cope with the realities of a college situation where logical empiricism is the going system in the department of philosophy and where the relation between science and religion is a matter of perennial interest to many students and faculty members.

Another correspondent suggests that "while the weighty tomes of the theologians must always be the fundamental literary basis of advanced training in religion, my own preparation as a teacher of undergraduates would have been greatly enhanced by a couple of solid courses in something like 'Religious Themes in the Contemporary Novel' and 'Religious Themes in Contemporary Drama.'" In order to facilitate communication with students and faculty this individual "would stress the importance of course work and research opportunities which probe the religious dimensions of literature, art, drama, depth psychology, sociology and other areas of contemporary culture." This is a sentiment shared by many.

Lest an emphasis on breadth be construed as a suggestion that depth be minimized we reiterate the conviction that the graduate student in religion should be given every encouragement to develop a high quality of theological scholarship and should be required to achieve a degree of competence in an area of specialization. We are not seeking a cheapened degree. The education

of the college teacher of religion should be as thorough and as rigorous as that of the seminary teacher. Furthermore, it does not seem wise to attempt to make any rigid distinction between preparation for college teaching and preparation for seminary teaching. What is desired primarily is first-rate scholars. In most instances, however, men of this caliber will produce a type of theological scholarship that is at home with and relevant to the secular disciplines.

Scholarship first, teaching a close second. Some teachers of religion feel that their graduate training gave them too little preparation for the actual process of teaching. One individual writes that he was thrown into college teaching with no preparation at all regarding what to expect of undergraduates, how to go about teaching, how to determine when learning is taking place, and what techniques to use in getting his subject matter across in the most effective way. This individual feels that he was forced to play it by ear for some time and that not a few undergraduates suffered not only from his inexperience but from his almost complete lack of "know-how." This individual is not sure that he is ready to ask the graduate institutions of religion to require courses in educational methods, but he is certain that more attention should be given to this matter.

Another correspondent expresses what is probably a fairly common sentiment in saying, "Although I share the widespread suspicion of formal education courses, I wish that I had had an opportunity to discuss with a few outstanding undergraduate teachers of religion the special problems that they have encountered in their experience and the techniques of teaching which they have found most effective." This individual also speaks with high praise of the conferences sponsored by the National Council on Religion in Higher Education for beginning teachers in religion. It would seem that this type of conference has much to offer in helping to orient the beginning teacher. At these conferences young teachers are given an opportunity to discuss syllabi, reading lists, teaching techniques, faculty responsibilities and other matters, with men who have had considerable teaching experience.

Courses in such subjects as educational psychology and the philosophy of liberal education may be of some help. Conferences such as those sponsored by the National Council on Religion in Higher Education have been helpful to many who have attended them. In the final analysis, however, there is no substitute for exposure to an actual teaching situation, especially if there is some guidance and encouragement available from an experienced hand. And for the man who is going to teach in college this should be at the undergraduate level if at all possible.

A more systematic internship program could produce valuable results. Increasingly seminaries are encouraging candidates for the B.D. degree to spend a year in the field. Possibly more attention should be given to the development of liaisons with colleges and universities where doctoral candidates in religion might spend an internship year in teaching. In effect a modified internship system is now in operation, since most graduate students in religion begin teaching before they have completed their degree work. However, the present system seems to be backwards. Most men who start teaching before their degree is completed do so when all that remains to be completed is the doctoral dissertation—possibly the most difficult and certainly the most specialized aspect of their graduate work. At this point they profit little by teaching—except possibly to furnish their families with a precarious living. As a matter of fact, in most instances, teaching proves to be a substantial barrier to the completion of the dissertation. The student finds he must set it aside in order to prepare to teach in areas almost entirely unrelated to it. Thus it becomes little more than a burdensome chore to complete the dissertation, a chore which seems to bear little relationship to his teaching other than the promise of a possible promotion and increase in salary when the Ph.D. is attached to his name. Perhaps the internship system is needed at an earlier stage in the graduate program when the student is still being prepared in breadth and when a teaching or tutorial experience might be more directly related to the items of study in the graduate program.

It might be argued that the period of graduate study in this field is inordinately long now. Why prolong it further with an internship year? As one who spent much of six years working toward the Ph.D. I realize there is merit in the argument. However, an internship experience early in the game could serve to strengthen the desire to teach and thus give added purpose and zest to further study, or it might bring home a realization that one is perhaps better qualified for some other vocation. (Some medical educators are now encouraging medical students to become exposed to the practice of medicine early in their careers in order that they might discover whether they have an ability and a taste for the practical as well as the theoretical side of medicine.)

Graduate education in religion has been unduly prolonged by the financial need of the student, a need which forces him to give less than full time to his studies even while in residence. A controlled internship experience fairly early in the graduate program *combined with* aid when the student nears the end of his program might be very helpful both in terms

of preparation for teaching and for scholarship. In this connection the recent announcement by the Sealantic Fund, Inc., of the Rockefeller Doctoral Fellowships in Religion is very encouraging. Under this program approximately forty-five fellowships will be awarded to promising candidates for the doctoral degree in religious studies. This and similar types of fellowship programs should enable the most promising graduate students in the field to complete their degree programs in a somewhat shorter period of time than is the case at present.

IV

My own experience leads me to suggest that what might be called the state of mind or mind-set of the graduate in religion is of no small importance in determining his approach to and success and well-being in college and university teaching. The man trained in a seminary-related program is geared to the seminary atmosphere. Quite naturally and quite properly, and especially if he is a promising young man, his teachers will groom him to do the same type of work that they are doing. He may look to college teaching as a desirable interim experience, but in the back of his mind—and probably not far back—will be the hope for a seminary position. Teaching in college is an apprenticeship, a place to try one's theological spurs, a lower rung on the ladder of success. The ultimate goal is the seminary where one can specialize and where the real issues are recognized and engaged, where one is at home with a group of like-minded colleagues, and where students are advanced enough to wrestle with what matters most. Unfortunately, when a person in this frame of mind is cast into the college situation he may seek to do little more than to warm over seminary fare and to serve it to undergraduates—sometimes with little benefit of seasoning.

The man who spends three to five years or more in a seminary or seminary-related graduate program is likely to have problems in adjusting emotionally and intellectually to college teaching. The seminary is a special type of institution with a highly selective and homogeneous constituency and an intellectual atmosphere all its own. The college, and even more, the university, is a heterogeneous community with a variety of intellectual (and nonintellectual) concerns. The issues of paramount importance to the seminary may be of little or no interest to the college community. Considerable effort is usually necessary to discover what issues are of importance in the college and to adjust one's own thought forms sufficiently to make contact with college students and faculty.

It is common for nearly all young teachers to suffer much over the intellectual level of undergraduates. The young teacher of religion is no

exception. A feeling of near-indecency grips him; he is nauseated; he is outraged that he must waste his talents on these intellectual nincompoops, these frivolous adolescents whose interests add up to sex, sports, and the hope for a mild dose of success. Quite naturally the young teacher of religion may soon long for the seminary where a somewhat more captive audience may sit at his feet. (We should add that he may also find many a practical-minded, unacademic, success-bound individual in his seminary audience.)

Help for what appears to me to be a real problem will be forthcoming as more graduate training in religion takes place in a university atmosphere and with some exposure to an undergraduate setting. It would also be helpful if men of stature in the seminary and the seminary-related graduate program would speak strongly for college and university teaching. Finally, a major need is for colleges and universities to raise their sights with respect to the type of education they offer in religion.

If religion is regarded as a second- or third-rate discipline in the college and university community, it is not too likely that young men of promise will prepare to teach it at that level. If, as in many institutions, religion as an academic discipline is little more than an adjunct of the college chapel or the campus Christian association, if one man is expected to wear two or three hats as teacher of religion (and philosophy!), as chaplain, as director of religious activities, and as general trouble shooter in charge of the petty problems of innocent and not-so-innocent freshmen women, then it is very difficult to attract a man whose primary interest is in religion as a field of study and research. (Lest I be misunderstood: the chapel, campus religious activities, counseling—all these and related doings have their place on most campuses. But in my opinion it is a mistake to tie them too closely to the study of religion. The teacher of religion should have no more extra-curricular involvements than the teacher of English literature.) If a teaching load of fifteen hours per week plus all the other duties of the normal college faculty member is heaped upon the young teacher of religion who is just beginning to nurture the tender plant of research, then it is no wonder that he will soon long for the graduate institution where he might have more time and more encouragement to devote to that plant.

As we see an increasing growth of good departments of religion we shall undoubtedly see some change in graduate training in religion; and, perhaps even more importantly, we shall see the vocation of teaching religion at the college and university level given an equal place with the parish ministry and teaching in seminary.

4. The Cosmos and the Ego

KEITH R. BRIDSTON

A small circle is quite an infinite as a large circle;
but, though it is quite as infinite, it is not so large.

G. K. CHESTERTON, *Orthodoxy*

IF A DENOMINATIONAL theological seminary could be considered a small circle and an interdenominational one a large circle, they are both infinite ecumenically. That is, neither automatically solves the problem of making theological training ecumenical. Both have their limitations. Though their dimensions may differ, they present equally difficult ecumenical riddles. The cosmos may seem to be more perplexing but the ego, as Chesterton says, "is more distant than any star."

It has been my somewhat dubious distinction as a student and teacher to have been affiliated with six theological institutions—two of which were explicitly denominational instruments for training the ministry of a particular church; two were denominational controlled but included members from other bodies; two were explicitly interdenominational. None of them, in my opinion, represents fully realized ecumenology! None (and I do not think those most intimately associated with them would care to claim it) has any grounds for pretending to be an ecumenical heaven brought down to earth.

It may be worth testifying to this because it is popularly supposed that ecumenical pearly gates only exist in front of the interdenominational institutions. Practically there may be some validity to this in terms of the passing to and fro of students and professors on ecumenical affairs. Theologically, however, it is simply not true. And since, despite the influential position of the interdenominational schools, most of the Christian ministry in the United States (and many other places too) is trained in denominational seminaries, it is well to underline the fact.

Of course, at this point there must be some definition of what one

KEITH R. BRIDSTON, B.D., Ph.D., is Executive Secretary of the Commission on Faith and Order, in the Division of Studies of the World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland. An Evangelical Lutheran, he formerly served on the World's Student Christian Federation, and on the theological faculties in Djakarta and in Siantar (Sumatra), Indonesia.

means by ecumenical. If ecumenical means simply interdenominational, then obviously an interdenominational seminary is ecumenical heaven, educationally speaking! For better or for worse, "ecumenical" is more than that; and indeed, is so much more that the educational circles of denominational and interdenominational are only relatively separated in their remote approximation to the ecumenical center. Take, for instance, the definition of J. C. Hoekendijk of Holland: "The whole Church, bringing the whole Gospel to the whole world." If, as this suggests, wholeness is the integral element in "ecumenical," then a glimpse is caught of the vision of William Temple when he spoke of the ecumenical movement as a fact both "great" and "new." And in these cosmic dimensions, the great question of whether it is ecumenically more significant for Congregationalists, Lutherans, Methodists and Presbyterians to sit together in the same classroom or separately in their own, becomes radically relativized. Ecumenically it is not an unimportant question; but certainly it is not the ultimate question. That question is whether the whole of theological training, which in most of its present forms has remained fundamentally unchanged for generations, can be re-oriented and reformed in all of its parts and ligaments and, in a dynamic way, ecumenically integrated. In short, there must be a new wholeness.¹

I

If the experience in other fields of knowledge is at all analogous, this process has only just begun. As in the physical sciences so in theology, theoretical revolutions are only gradually comprehended intellectually or incarnated organically. As Arnold Toynbee put it in his Gifford Lectures:

Mid-way through the twentieth century we Westerners are still exploring the Universe from the mathematico-physical angle that our seventeenth-century predecessors chose for us. . . . This radical change of orientation required of the seventeenth-century Western mental pioneers who made it a great effort of will and imagination as well as a great effort of thought, and the spectacle of their prowess should inspire us to follow their example now at their expense.²

Or as Herbert Butterfield has suggested in regard to discoveries in the field of physiology:

It has been pointed out concerning some of the writers of the sixteenth century that, though they talked of the importance of seeing things with one's own eyes, they still could not observe a tree or a scene in nature without noticing just those things which the classical writers had taught them to look at. . . .

¹ I use the term in this paper as it has been given ecumenical content and currency by Oliver S. Tomkins, recently named Bishop of Bristol, in his book, *The Wholeness of the Church*, S. C. M. Press, 1949.

² Toynbee, A. J., *An Historian's Approach to Religion*, Oxford University Press, 1956, p. 286.

Indeed, when in the field of anatomy an original mind emerged in the second quarter of the sixteenth century in the person of Vesalius, even he, finding that he differed from Galen, said (like others) that at first he could not believe his own eyes. . . .

We who look at the story from the wrong side of the great transition—with the history inverted because we know the answer beforehand—are tempted to see Harvey's predecessors as foolish and *ipso facto* to miss the greatness of Harvey's own achievement. Yet once again we must wonder both in the past and in the present that the human mind, which goes on collecting facts, is so inelastic, so slow to change its framework of reference.³

If we may consider the ecumenical movement to be something in the order of "great" and "new" in the life of the churches, it is hardly to be expected that it should be immediately or easily comprehended in theological education. The old forms—both denominational and interdenominational—are still largely determined by pre-ecumenical categories, and, as Butterfield says of the persistence of Aristotelian teaching on the idea of motion in the post-Galileo period, "precisely because it was part of a system which was such a colossal intellectual feat in itself—was hard for the human mind to escape from," so the old forms of theological training are also parts of "colossal" systems such as the German Reformation or the Anglican Establishment, which are no less difficult to escape.

The basic weakness in many present attempts to introduce the ecumenical leaven into the theological training loaves is that "ecumenism" is considered to be something in itself. Ecumenical movement as a theological fact both "new" and "great" (and which therefore challenges in a radical and total way the whole present order of things) is missed. As Halford Luccock, writing as "Simeon Stylites" in the *Christian Century*, has expressed it in his inimitable style:

For "ecumenical" is one of the most colorless words in the English language—granted for the moment that it is English, which is doubtful. It is a regular albino of a word. One reason, of course, is that at present it does not convey any concrete pictures. It does not come "out of the everywhere into the here." It conveys only the picture of a company of church leaders with well filled brief cases hurrying to catch a plane for a conference at Timbuktu. A noble company of saints. But thought of them does not arouse unrestrained enthusiasm.⁴

Or as Petrarch said of his peripatetic secretary long ago, "It is a strange madness, this desire to be for ever sleeping in a strange bed."

As long as the ecumenical is thought to be the exotic, the *ordo vagorum*

³ Butterfield, H., *The Origins of Modern Science*. London: G. Bell, 1957, pp. 33f., 41.

⁴ August 20, 1958, p. 959.

of modern ecclesiastical life, it presents no real challenge to the present state of things in theological education, denominational or interdenominational. A strange madness, but as long as it is strange, something which can be tolerated and perhaps even assimilated.

It is for this reason, I believe, that most theological institutions are ecumenically complacent today. In many denominational institutions it is thought sufficient to send a respectable number of students and teachers to ecumenical conferences—preferably overseas; offer a course or two in “Ecumenics”; and have a few visitors in black or tan skins to give some “ecumenical color” to the surroundings. The basic theological orientation remains rigidly traditional, however, and the chief aim and purpose is to produce well indoctrinated, loyal, conformist ministers to staff the existing congregations of the denomination. If some kind of vague, sentimental attachment to “the world church” is developed at the same time, and the levels of “ecumenical spirit” raised, so much the better. But it is in no sense a *sine qua non*. It is simply added to the basic elements, like fancy whipped cream to the cake.

This attitude has been neatly summed up by a younger theologian in a paper for his denominational association when he speaks of “our conviction that theology must necessarily be confessional if it is to be real and concrete.” “Necessarily” is a strong word, and assuming that it is meant in this way, “ecumenical” seems to be relegated to some vaporous theological limbo, with hardly even the reality and concreteness of whipped cream.

At the other extreme, the blurb of the dust cover of a recent book on ecumenical theology solemnly affirms that in the work “is posited a truly universal Christian theology, genuinely nonsectarian, ecumenical in outreach and appeal . . . [part of] the intensified search for supra-denominational solutions to religious questions.” In his book, *Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach*, even as perceptive an ecumenist as my friend Walter Marshall Horton indeed comes very close to this position when he prefaces it:

I have been convinced for most of my life that sectarian theology is something just as absurd as the “Baptist astronomy” which a devout Baptist trustee of the University of Chicago wanted to have taught there in the early days. That is why I went to Union Theological Seminary instead of to some denominational school; that is why I have been happy to spend my life in another interdenominational school of theology, at Oberlin. . . .⁵

Without wishing at all to detract from the enormous contributions

⁵ Harper & Brothers, 1955, p. ix.

which interdenominational institutions and their members have made to the ecumenical movement (any more than one would wish to detract from the essential contributions which have come from strong confessional and denominational quarters), one is led to feel that the temptation to ecumenical complacency is even more acute on the interdenominational than on the denominational side because it is more subtle. In the interdenominational seminary there may be a recognition that "ecumenical" is not only the frosting, but also what goes into the cake. Unfortunately, it is often forgotten that no matter how good the materials, unless there is a good recipe and the cake is well baked, it may fall flat and the result may be indigestible. The mere fact of having an interdenominational teaching staff and a student body representing umpteen churches is no guarantee of real ecumenical vitality. Professors independent from their mother churches, and often unconsciously cut off from their confessional heritage, may easily become theological individualists. And putting theologically unformed students in the same dormitories and encouraging them to brush their teeth over the same washbowls does not insure substantial ecumenical confrontation between the great historic traditions of Christendom. All too easily, the interdenominational seminary can become an ivory tower of denominational and confessional peaceful coexistence, and therefore its atmosphere is an ecumenical soporific rather than an ecumenical stimulant. Pascal's warning that "neutrality is the very soul of the sect" may not be far off the mark here.

How to move interdenominational seminaries beyond the stage of "minimum ecumenism"—Christian co-operation on the basis of the lowest common denominator—is as much a problem as moving denominational seminaries from an even earlier stage of development, "confessional isolationism." Whatever the virtues of one over against the other may be, both are equally outmoded if "ecumenical" is understood as having to do with the wholeness—with the renewal of the Church in unity, witness and service. Or, to return to the image of the circles, their infinite distance from the center is only relatively affected by their difference in size.

Under these circumstances it is imperative that both denominational and interdenominational seminaries should honestly recognize their ecumenical deficiencies (they are already sufficiently aware of their respective ecumenical virtues not to have to dwell on them!). To claim to be ecumenical when in fact one is pre-ecumenical or ecumenically outdated is a disservice both to oneself and to the best that "ecumenical" stands for. Virginia Woolf in *Orlando* wrote:

In this house they think themselves happy; in that witty; in a third profound. It is all an illusion . . . so no real happiness, no real wit, no real profundity are tolerated where the illusion prevails. This serves to explain why Madame du Deffand said no more than three witty things in the course of fifty years. Had she said more, her circle would have been destroyed.⁶

A false ecumenism can have precisely this kind of desperate result. An "ecumenical interdenominational theological seminary," for example, which is in fact based on the old principle of minimum ecumenism, and which therefore in the name of "ecumenical" outlaws real and vital clashes between radically different confessional parties, is not ecumenical, probably not theological, and perhaps not even seminal. Or, on the other hand, an "ecumenical denominational seminary" which refuses to take "ecumenical" any more seriously than as a nontheological frosting, fails to appreciate that the great confessional traditions are condemned to theological sterility unless they once again turn toward one another to find the wholeness which they now represent only in a fragmentary way. When this is done seriously, then "ecumenical" becomes something far more penetrating and acetic than whipped cream.

II

What practically it may mean for present-day theological training, both denominational and interdenominational, to take the ecumenical with radical seriousness in its deepest and broadest meaning, is not easy to say. It is obvious that reformations, and in some cases revolutions, will have to take place. Several could be suggested, but one or two may be sufficient to make the point.

For one thing, introducing the ecumenical *may* mean more extracurricular activities for students and staff, adding another department, setting up a new chair, or even putting another course in the already overcrowded curriculum. However, the ecumenical must become not the exotic but the integral, in fact, the basic point of orientation for the whole training. For what is at stake is not "ecumenism" but wholeness. As Socrates says in *Phaedo*: "You, if you take my advice, will think little about Socrates, but a great deal about Truth."

If "ecumenical" is thus seen not as something in itself, but that which has to do with the wholeness and renewal of the Church, confronting the whole present order of things with the living Word of God calling forth new life, each discipline is then challenged to re-examine its own *raison d'être* and to justify its place in the training in relation to all other disciplines, and to the whole life and mission of the Church in the world.

⁶ Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1928, pp. 199f.

What could this imply for a basic subject such as dogmatics? In a remarkable paper given at a World's Student Christian Federation conference for theological students entitled "Dogmatics and Ecumenism,"⁷ Hans Iwand suggests a reopening of the old confessional theological engagements:

What are the confessional churches? They live alongside one another with astonishing tolerance. Their creeds immobilize decisions which were never actualized. Their doctrinal alignments evoke stagnant and frozen waters. When winter comes the water freezes over and can no longer flow. The significance of dogmatics is that the time of this standstill is over, that spring is coming: a real separation, and therefore also a real unity, become possible. . . . The battle which began in the past has not been fought to a conclusion. We took to winter quarters and both sides sent greetings back and forth without knowing whether they were friends or foes. But as soon as dogmatics starts deciding again, it must stop pretending to develop a Lutheran or Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper; once more the battle over the problem of the Lord's Supper must be permitted to rage. For dogmatics does not recognize any coexistence of differing doctrines of a relative truth. It recognizes only one truth. . . .

This obviously means more than adding a course in "History of the Ecumenical Movement" to the theological curriculum! "Ecumenical" is here being identified with the great theological struggle for truth, a struggle in which every church is engaged but one which must eventually result in a decision. And a real decision can only be reached if the churches engage in this struggle together. The point is that the churches are to come together not just to come together, but that together (and this means to engage in real dogmatic battle) there may come a mutual recognition of one truth. As Iwand sees it: "Ecumenicity is not put together like a jigsaw puzzle in which one tries to join different pieces into a whole," but is rather "a lightning flash which lights up the sky from east to west" by which the great dogmatic struggle for one truth can be waged and is to be judged, and which ultimately "will draw us out of the churches of our fathers, and lead us into a new land where we shall be able to begin within a new unity of life."

In a cathartic way, this cuts through the fuzzy religiosity which identifies the ecumenical movement with sentimental togetherness, or even with jet-propelled church leaders clutching well-filled briefcases. It rejects the humanitarian do-goodism which believes ecumenical organizations to be religious shadows of the United Nations and its agencies. In these terms, if ecumenism is "a strange madness," at least it is not a madness which has to do exclusively with the desire to sleep in strange beds. Its madness (which

⁷ *Student World* XLIII, p. 337.

has tormented Christians through the ages and has led the world to accuse them from the very beginning till now of being "filled with new wine") is the insatiable desire for wholeness—within oneself, with one's fellows, with God—which the unity of the Church represents and which can only be fully realized through the recognition of one truth.

To introduce the ecumenical into theological training has to do, therefore, not with curriculum juggling but with inducing madness!

It may be argued that dogmatics has already created enough lunacy in church history without asking for more. But it has so often been the wrong kind: the madness of separation rather than the madness of love and unity. Here one sees again the importance of the fact of the ecumenical movement being something "new." In the past, the desire for wholeness has become inextricably involved with separation and division. The passionate concern for the whole truth which can be seen in the Lutheran Reformation or in the Wesleyan Revival became identified (against the intention of both Luther and Wesley) with church segmentation and sectarianism. Luther and Wesley were not unaware of the tension between truth and unity (Wesley remained an Anglican priest throughout his life, and Luther to the very end spoke nostalgically of "the holy Roman church" despite all its corruptions) but they were unable to bring them into proper relation. The ecumenical movement is "new" in that it recognizes the paradoxical tension of truth and unity, but at the same time sees that the desire for wholeness makes that paradoxical tension dynamic and unifying instead of dynamic and divisive as it has been so often in the past.

A new dogmatics is thus required in both denominational and inter-denominational theological training if that training is to be truly ecumenical. In a denominational seminary this may mean providing more opportunities for guest lecturers representing other traditions and confessional positions. It may mean several denominational seminaries in the same area co-operating in the dogmatic field: mixing some of their classes, exchanging professors, arranging courses in which provision is made for dogmatic engagement from clearly specified confessional positions on particular topics. Of course, there are many other possibilities.

In an interdenominational seminary this might mean enlarging the theological field (along with the increased staff required) so that confessional dogmatics is a recognized discipline along with systematics and historical theology. Here again, provision would have to be made for the living confrontation between confessions and traditions, in the persons of articulate representatives from them, through which ecumenical engagement becomes

visible and personalized. As A. N. Whitehead has written: "There is no royal road to learning through an airy path of brilliant generalizations. . . . The problem of education is to make the pupil see the wood by means of the trees."⁸ Again, the possibilities and variations are almost limitless.

For both denominational and interdenominational schools the new dogmatics would be fulfilling much the same function as the Faith and Order Movement has traditionally performed for the churches: "to draw Churches out of isolation into conferences, in which none is asked to be disloyal to or to compromise its convictions, but to seek to explain them to others while seeking to understand their points of view."⁹ It would at the same time, as Faith and Order itself does, seek "To proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ and . . . the obligation to manifest that unity and its urgency for the work of evangelism."

III

Evangelism marks a transition into a new realm. This is quite natural and, educationally, inevitable. Dogmatics is only one part of the curriculum. Other subjects need ecumenical scrutiny. As has been pointed out, ecumenical theological education means not just a new course in the curriculum, or the reformation of one of the old courses, but the impregnation and reorientation of the training in all of its parts. The whole must be ecumenically reintegrated.

And where is that to happen? In each of the students. The cosmos must come to rest in the ego. The size of the circle only affects the technique; the essential problem is the same. For four years I taught theology in Indonesia. My first classroom in Sumatra was an abandoned barracks of a former Japanese concentration camp. We shared the room with the birds which flew through the open windows and sang to us from the beams overhead, not to mention various other fascinating forms of tropical wildlife. It was a fairly primitive cry from some of the so-called "ecumenical centers" in Geneva, London, or New York. The students came from small, remote villages up and down the Sumatran highlands. They were a homogeneous group representing one nation, one church, and not least, one tribe. Where does one start being ecumenical in this setting?

This, at least, was the way I tried. "What does ecumenical mean? First: You, Tobing, and you, Simundjuntak, come from Silindung and from Toba. You are of families which probably used to fight one another. Now

⁸ Whitehead, A. N., *The Aims of Education*, The Macmillan Company, 1929, p. 18.

⁹ Constitution of the Commission on Faith and Order.

you are members of one *Huria Kristen Batak Protestant* and you are here in the same classroom studying for the Christian ministry. *Unity* is what ecumenical means. Second: All of you in this classroom are here because of the evangelical vision of a crippled Danish-German farm boy who came to the ends of the earth less than a hundred years ago and fearlessly preached the gospel to your cannibalistic forefathers. *Mission* is what ecumenical means. Third: We are here together, an American fraternal helper teaching theology to a class of Indonesians. *Service* is what ecumenical means." There you have it. It is only a beginning. But the ecumenical cosmos has been reduced to the ego. The lofty ecumenical triad of unity, mission and service is being indigenized.

Something of this sort has to be done in every theological classroom. The same thing must be done whether that classroom is denominational or interdenominational, or whether it is in New York or in Bangalore. However large or small, the circle has all the essential ecumenical ingredients within it. As St. Anthony said long ago, "Sit in thy cell, and thy cell shall teach thee all things." The circle of every theological classroom has infinite ecumenical dimensions.

Translating the ecumenical cosmos to the ego has another important function. It underlines the fact that one does not have to become something different in order to be ecumenical. To be ecumenical does not mean to become "ecumenized." It means to be truly oneself. In this day of enormous pressures to massify man, of huge impersonal powers of conformism, the ecumenical movement can easily be misunderstood as a religious counterpart to them. Because ecumenical stands for wholeness and renewal and not deathly conformity, it stands against the spirit of this age and therefore has something of value to contribute both to the ego and to the cosmos. As Robert Graves has written:

This is perhaps a critical rather than a creative age. As a result of universal education, two world wars, slum clearance, social security, mass production, the eclipse of high society, the industrialization of agriculture, and the tranquillizing influence of the B.B.C., the British have lost most of their eccentric ebullience. . . . The angry young English writers are angry because, until the next war or recession, they have so little to be angry about; they always know where their next meal (however tasteless, until they drench it with H.P. sauce) is coming from, and where to queue up for a table. What is even worse, any slight mania or differentiating oddness which they should guard as jealously as a savage guards the stone or tree that houses his soul, they now take along to the National Health psychiatrist, pleading to be de-thinged.¹⁰

¹⁰ *Times Literary Supplement*, August 15, 1958.

Without the healing touch of madness, the cosmos and the ego can never be comprehended as one whole. Without some strange madness—some mania or differentiating oddness—the self cannot be the self. And the cosmos without the self is void. Quite rightly there is a growing fear that the ecumenical movement may “jell” prematurely; that it may, reflecting the consolidating and centripetal trend of our age, become a movement of uniformity rather than unity, of conformity rather than cohesive diversity. Rightly understood, “ecumenical” stands—in an all too sane ecclesiastical world—for wholeness. In the grand arc of that comprehensive circle both cosmos and ego have their place. And, in the mundane world of theological training, both denominational and interdenominational have their place within it—not one on one side and one on the other of it.

What one *sees* of the ecumenical in its organizational manifestations may fall far short of this. As T. S. Eliot wrote before the World Council of Churches was even in process of formation:

Perhaps this is inevitable; all incarnations (with One exception) fall short of their idea. But this is all the more reason why, in seeking to make theological training ecumenical, a paraphrase of Socrates' words should be inscribed on the doorpost of every denominational and interdenominational house, reading: "You, if you take my advice, will think little about Ecumenism, but a great deal about Truth."

¹¹ Choruses from T. S. Eliot, *The Rock*. Copyright, 1934, by Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc. Used by permission.

The Protestant Church-Related College in Tomorrow's Higher Education

ASA S. KNOWLES

NEARLY ALL EDUCATORS in the United States are keenly aware that higher education in this country is not going to continue to "do business as usual." Developments which have occurred and others which will stem from these indicate that the future over-all pattern of American higher education will be quite different from that of today.

Educators today have a widespread understanding of and interest in the revolutionary changes which are taking place in the organization and pattern of education in the United States. Quite naturally they are making plans for the future roles of their institutions. They are all aware that atomic power, radio and television communication, automation, jet propulsion and many other recent technological developments are altering man's concepts of space, time, and his own relationships with the world around him. All of this is happening at a time when the population of the U.S. is expanding rapidly and critical shortages exist in those professions which require college, graduate school and professional education. It is quite natural, therefore, that individual colleges and groups of colleges are reviewing their roles and objectives.

In recent months events have transpired which are accelerating the changes in the patterns of higher education. Steps have been taken which assure that even larger numbers than previously estimated will attend college, and the significance of higher education in the welfare of our society is appreciated as never before. The launching of the Sputniks by Russia focused attention on the importance of education in our society to the extent that it is now an instrument of national security. To this end federal funds are to be available to improve the quality of instruction at all levels of education, to motivate more able youth to attend college and to assist them financially when needed, to make more widespread the teaching of

ASA S. KNOWLES, A.M., LL.D., formerly President of the University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio, is President-Elect of Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts. This article is an abridgement of an address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Commission on Higher Education of the National Council of Churches in Omaha, Nebraska, February 9, 1958.

science and mathematics, and to encourage more persons to enter the teaching profession.

Some of the emerging features of tomorrow's higher education which will shape new over-all patterns twenty years hence are now evident. These are broad and far-reaching in scope. The *next two decades* are sure to see new patterns in higher education in the United States. Emerging features seem to be:¹

1. There may be perhaps twice as many colleges as at present, most of the new ones being two-year community colleges serving students living at home.

2. We can expect colleges to enroll 50 per cent more students than most current estimates of 5,000,000 by the '70's. Two years of college education will become commonplace experience of the American youth. The time is near when approximately one out of every two high-school graduates will seek some post-high-school collegiate education.

3. Many existing colleges and universities will change in significance and in services they offer. Reorganization of the programs in many of the stronger four-year institutions will see more emphasis on junior, senior and graduate-level instruction.

4. Commuting students who comprise already the largest segment of undergraduates (estimated to be 60 per cent) will grow in numbers with a consequent lessening of the relative significance of the dormitory-type college in the over-all scene of American higher education.

5. Because more rapid growth of population in urban areas is expected, there will be an increase in the number of colleges (both four-year and two-year) serving these areas. It is likely, however, that many of these new institutions and particularly the new two-year colleges will be public in character.

6. The foregoing emerging features may have an impact on the nation's educational system as a whole, modifying the traditional high school-college relationship. The widespread development of the two-year college could result in an acceleration of the so-called six/four/four program of education. Two decades from now many small cities or urban areas may boast that they offer free education from kindergarten to a degree.

7. The most eminent universities will become centers for advanced study and research, serving states or regions, with some as national centers.

Today when education has become an instrument of national security,

¹ For more detailed information see Knowles, Asa S., "Emerging Features of Tomorrow's Higher Education," in *The Educational Record*, October, 1957.

it is important to keep it from becoming too narrow. We must preserve that quality of education which has stemmed from church colleges where moral training and character development always have been stressed.

Church leaders see that an increase in public institutions means more burden upon the taxpayer and an added problem of providing adequate funds for their own institutions. They must think in terms of priorities to be sure the emphasis is at the right place.

CHANGING PATTERNS AND THE CHURCH COLLEGES

America owes a great debt to her church-related colleges. Founded originally to assure the church an enlightened and educated clergy, they have provided opportunities over the years for education for all types of Christian leaders. The influence of men and women educated in church-related colleges upon the public and private life of Western civilization has been one of the greatest contributions of the Christian church. The church-related colleges boast among their graduates many distinguished Americans.

In the United States particularly, where two-thirds of the church membership is Protestant, the Protestant church-related college has been in a singular position of leadership and has played a very important role in setting standards and patterns for higher education. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the only colleges in this country were those founded and operated by the churches. Despite a widespread growth in public higher education, many of the best colleges in the United States today are church-related or had their origins in the church—as did several of the state universities and state teachers' colleges. In a recent list of leading colleges in the United States, colleges which are now or were previously church-related comprise the majority of those designated as the best among the men's, women's and coeducational undergraduate colleges in our country.

In a democratic society a large segment of private enterprise in higher education is important. The church-related colleges, which are included among those known as independent colleges of the country, have certainly contributed to the variety and strength of the United States system of higher education.

Characteristics of Church-Related Colleges

It is not possible to appreciate the effect of changing patterns of higher education on any college or group of colleges except as one may have an understanding of the role of a college or group of colleges in our present-

day society. This role is revealed in part by the characteristics of a particular college or particular group of colleges. A review of some of the characteristics of the church-related colleges is enlightening and interesting.

A Protestant sect or church group either founded or sponsored each college and some sect or group continues to sponsor or foster each college. The church tie, however, is designated by many different labels such as "related to," "controlled by," "owned by," "identified with," or "sponsored by." (The church group to which a college is related, or by which it is owned or controlled, hereinafter will be designated as a "sponsoring group." This term will be used to designate all degrees of relationship.)

Governing boards may be comprised wholly of members of a sponsoring group or merely a majority of this group. In some instances the sponsor must approve the board membership. Laymen and representatives of faiths other than the sponsor do serve on many church college boards, and in a few instances they appear to be a majority of the board. The by-laws of some church colleges require that the chief executive officer be a member of the clergy of the sponsoring church or a lay member of the faith.

Financial support is derived at least in part from one or more sponsoring churches or organizations within the same sect. This support varies greatly in amount and significance. Some colleges receive no funds whatever from sponsors and others are dependent upon their sponsors for continued operation. One college, having a faculty and student body of a particular faith, appears to take pride in the fact that the church has no control and provides no financial support. In general, however, the church colleges tend to be selective of their sources of funds, refusing to accept any from sources considered "tainted" or sources which may influence the control of the college.

The type of college and services rendered vary greatly, too. Church colleges include liberal arts colleges, institutions made up of liberal arts colleges and theological schools, small universities, large universities, and two-year colleges. They are located in rural areas, small towns, cities and large metropolitan areas. Different environments influence greatly the scope of service and programs. Some of the colleges are wholly undergraduate, some include within their framework large graduate and professional schools, and those in urban areas make extensive offerings for adults, including a great variety of professional courses. In size the church colleges vary from some of the smallest colleges in the United States to some of the very largest—at least two or three are included among the twenty-five universities having the largest enrollments in the country.

The objectives and aims of these colleges are stated in nearly all catalogues as "Christian education." The programs of study, textbooks and reference materials are essentially the same as those found in nonsectarian colleges except that courses in religion and the Bible, and perhaps compulsory chapel attendance, are added.

The student bodies vary in makeup, too. A few colleges admit only members of the sponsoring group or give preference to this group. The vast majority, however, seem eager to admit those of any faith. Catalogues may state, for example, that the college is Christian in character but non-sectarian in service. The catalogue of one college states specifically that the college admits only "orthodox" Christians.

Rules governing the conduct of student life vary from those which are very strict, prohibiting dancing and theater going, to those essentially the same as nonsectarian institutions.

Religious requirements for faculty appointment have a wide range. Some institutions insist upon membership in a particular faith; others insist on this only insofar as it is possible to obtain teachers who are competent in various subject matters. Still others seem not to have too much concern with church affiliation provided members of the church sponsoring group are sufficient in number to be a majority of the entire faculty.

Quality of instruction, like that to be found in other institutions, ranges from standards which do not meet requirements for accreditation to standards which are deemed among the best in our country.

In the years ahead, as in the past, one may expect that the church-related colleges will undergo many modifications. There will be new ones established. Some will separate from the church; others will merge; some supported now by one denomination may be supported by several at a later time, and ownership of campuses and properties will change hands among various church groups. Similar changes have been taking place for many years and there is every reason to believe that they will continue.

PRIORITIES IN USE OF FUNDS—KEY TO FUTURE ROLE

Church leaders and others concerned with church-related colleges realize that as the number of public institutions is increased there will be a greater tax burden upon everyone, and members of specific denominations may have an added problem in obtaining adequate funds for their own institutions. It would seem, therefore, that those concerned with the welfare of Protestant church-related colleges should give some thought to

priorities in the use of funds which will be available to them in the years ahead for higher education.

Suggested priorities with respect to use of funds from various sources which church-related colleges may be expected to have available in the years ahead are:

- (1) The strengthening and expanding of theological education.
- (2) Putting more emphasis on "advanced education" in some existing four-year colleges and universities.
- (3) Increasing the number of church-related two-year colleges.
- (4) Reconsidering the colleges and universities to be given church financial support.
- (5) Stronger support for those existing colleges and universities which have a reputation for high quality work.
- (6) Strengthening and expanding of religious work on nonsectarian campuses.
- (7) Giving greater emphasis to unique type of education emphasizing the standards of conduct of sponsoring groups.
- (8) Expanding of adult education services.
- (9) Developing of universities designed to serve the church education needs of sponsoring groups.

(1) Theological Education

Certainly in these times the education of persons to enter the ministry and various church vocations should be a top priority in the use of finances provided by church organizations and members of any given denomination. Some existing schools of theology should be strengthened, others should be expanded, and certainly some church organizations will see the need to establish some new schools of theology during the next twenty years.

The growing population of the United States makes it necessary to have more clergymen, priests, college teachers, and persons in other church vocations. Consequently, many denominations are facing an urgent need to motivate more youth to enter the ministry and other church vocations. This need for motivation comes at a time when youth seems more prone to enter business and industry because of larger financial inducements. Some Protestant church organizations should consider seriously the financial support of one or more liberal arts colleges which have as their sole purpose the education of youth to undertake advanced education in either theological schools or universities which can prepare them for church vocations. (The

course programs of undergraduate colleges could be designed specifically to provide a high quality liberal arts education and still offer special instruction to orient youth to the fields of church work they plan to enter.)

It would seem appropriate for some church-related colleges to work closely with their sponsoring church organization to make available more free education for those youth who are willing to enter the service of the church. Certainly a strong case could be built for generous financial support on the part of churches for those colleges meeting these needs.

(2) Emphasis on Advanced Education

The growth in numbers of community colleges and the high cost of living away from home while attending college will cause more youth to attend college for two years while still living at home. This means that instead of entering as freshmen, an increasing number of those who wish a church-related type of education may seek to enter these colleges as juniors. Some of the established church colleges, therefore, should be giving thought to placing emphasis on advanced education (junior and senior level and even first year graduate school). By doing this they will be conforming to a pattern of higher education which, it appears, will become more widespread in this country in the future. The use of existing facilities for this advanced education will relieve the necessity of expanding too greatly the physical facilities and faculties of some of the existing church-related colleges.

(3) More Two-Year Colleges

As more church-related colleges conform to the trend of emphasizing advanced education, some denominations should focus increasing attention on expanding the number of church-related two-year colleges as well as expanding the size and services of those which now exist.

There are in the United States today more than 600 two-year colleges; nearly one-third of these are church-related. Some of these are performing the real function of a community college. The vast majority are comparatively small in size of enrollment. Since it appears that there will be a tremendous growth in the number of publicly supported community colleges, it would seem appropriate for church organizations to sponsor more two-year colleges and at the same time support more generously and expand the size of those which they now sponsor. This field of education should not be dominated by institutions which are public in character.

Many churches, particularly in urban centers, have school facilities of superior quality. At present these are used relatively few hours each week. It would seem appropriate that these facilities be used in some instances to make beginnings in the establishing of two-year college programs. These programs might begin as adult education offerings, using initially the faculties of the appropriate (nearby) church colleges on a part-time basis and other persons available in the community. As these programs grow, they could be extended to make available offerings in the day and thereby perhaps become full-fledged church-sponsored two-year colleges. This method of expanding church-related community colleges would not entail tremendous outlays for capital expenditure.

(4) Reconsideration of Support

Church-related colleges which are marginal from the standpoint of being weak in scholarship and poorly financed (the two go hand in hand) should be bolstered and strengthened if they are needed and designed to serve the particular special education needs of the sponsoring church; otherwise, they should be encouraged to become public or private institutions, perhaps in some instances to become good two-year colleges rather than inadequate four-year colleges. The removal of some institutions from church support would permit diverting more money to support the stronger church-related institutions of higher learning.

Combining or merging of colleges should be accomplished where desirable. For example, the merging of some institutions to develop one strong institution offering liberal arts, theological and graduate work is much to be preferred to maintaining several separate plants and faculties operated on a marginal or submarginal basis of standards and efficiency.

In some cases, churches apparently are contributing to the support of colleges and universities which have become essentially public in nature. Some of these institutions appear to recruit students and hire faculty members irrespective of their religious faith and have the same standards of conduct as public institutions. To the extent that this may be true, the sponsoring church is joining in the role of host at an institution which is basically similar to public institutions. While this is generous of the sponsoring church, it should be recognized that money is perhaps being taken out of the church collection plate to do what could be done with public tax support and other private resources not available to religious organizations.

(5) Stronger Support for Some Colleges

Those Protestant church-related colleges which are recognized as being of high quality and which include some of the best private colleges in our country should certainly be continued and strengthened as church-related colleges. Some of these colleges should perhaps review their role in our society from the standpoint of the groups they are serving and whether or not they are truly fulfilling their function as *Protestant* church-related colleges. If some of these institutions were to restrict their size and give greater emphasis to serving their respective church clientele, their present facilities and available financial resources when combined with the financial support their churches should provide would continue them at top levels of performance.

(6) Religious Work on Other Campuses

The numbers of youth of college age who will be served by Protestant church-related colleges in the years ahead may be a relatively small segment of the total number of youth in our country who are of college age.

It is estimated that by 1970 approximately 70 per cent of all college-age youth attending college in the United States will be enrolled in some type of publicly supported institution of higher learning. Only the State with its powers of taxation is able to provide sufficient funds to serve rapidly expanding numbers at relatively low tuition costs. When one adds to the number which may be expected to enroll in publicly supported institutions those who may be expected to enroll in nonsectarian private colleges and in Roman Catholic colleges, one appreciates that the percentage of the total of college-age youth of the nation which Protestant church-related colleges may be expected to reach and serve will be relatively small. The total numbers served, however, may be larger than the total served today. This does not mean that the students in the public and nonsectarian private colleges should be deprived of religious activities and influence of the church. Quite the contrary. Practically all public and nonsectarian private colleges and universities welcome religious activities and religious services for their students.

In order to serve adequately the expanding population of Protestant college youth there must be an expansion of religious work on the nonchurch-related college campuses. The Protestant church-related colleges should take the lead in training and supplying competent personnel for these activities. The churches must afford the funds which will assist their own

colleges in educating the religious leadership and in developing the means for serving their young people in college wherever they are located.

(7) Unique Type of Education

As public education assumes new patterns or organization and development, is it not logical for more of the church-related colleges to give greater emphasis to being even more distinctive in character, both in the type of education they offer and the standards of conduct they expect of students? This could be accomplished particularly by the church-related college which is church controlled. It could insist upon the standards of the church being followed in daily life; exemplary character would be an objective, attendance at religious services compulsory. The standards of conduct of the church relative to smoking, use of alcoholic beverages, membership in fraternities, dancing, theater attendance and card playing would be expected of those attending these institutions.

Many parents prefer education of their children by church-related colleges because they expect that their children's character, conduct and standards will be molded in large part by the college atmosphere, associations and instruction. Then, too, it must not be overlooked that many families want their children to attend this type of college to associate with those having similar beliefs. They desire, also, that their sons and daughters attend coeducational colleges sponsored by their own church denomination so that they will marry in the same faith. In any event, many parents want their children to develop Christian character based on Christian concepts which are taught and practiced both in their own home and church, and they want their children to have a Christian philosophy of life and particularly the philosophy of the sponsoring church group. The right to insist on this type of education for one's children is a privilege of our democracy.

(8) Adult Education

Another priority is adult education; that is, provision of more courses or programs for clergy in service and lay leaders of the Church. These course programs might take the form of evening courses, short weekend institutes or vacation-time institutes. Curricula could include theology courses aimed at personal programs in religion and courses for church leaders such as Sunday-school teachers, social leaders and so forth. Moreover, adult programs leading to degrees in these study areas could well be established. This education might be limited to members of the particular sect who are in good standing. In this way the church would bolster its

strength and influence in the community. Some of these programs might be developed into church-sponsored community colleges.

(9) Universities Serving Church Educational Needs

The larger church groups might well support a strong church-related university which is truly church oriented in its graduate and professional work. The mission of such a church-sponsored university should be to continue research and offer instruction for the professional advancement of clergy and other religious workers. It should also provide opportunities for advanced and professional education for faculty of schools of theology and church-related colleges supported by the denomination concerned.

The university could profitably conduct research on current problems, on relating religion to modern life, and on biblical literature. This research should provide pertinent data for problems of church government, church location, recruitment of clergy, conduct of theological education, supervision of religious education, official stands on questions of public policy affecting churches, church financing and fund raising. Moreover, such a church-related university should provide educational opportunities for lay religious workers as well as clergy.

THE CHALLENGE

The emerging features of tomorrow's higher education do indeed present a challenge to the church-related colleges. This is a challenge to provide a high quality type of education which is unique in the demands it imposes on the individual in the development of character and those qualities of leadership which are needed not only as a bulwark of strength for the church itself, but also to provide competent Christian leadership in every phase of our democratic society.

The Historical Element in the Fourth Gospel

FREDERICK C. GRANT

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS ago the Abingdon Press published a book of mine entitled *The Growth of the Gospels*.¹ In that book I described Ernest F. Scott's work, *The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Theology*,² as "still the best general introduction to the Gospel of John." I think I can still use those words, only amplifying them to say "one of the best." I can also recommend the books which were named along with it, old though they now are. For the major studies of John which have appeared since 1933 have not discredited the old view, viz. that John was "the Gospel of the Hellenists," that it presupposes a later and wider *milieu* than that taken for granted in the tradition underlying the Synoptic Gospels, and that its point of view is quite different from the one presupposed by any of the other three Gospels, Mark, Luke or Matthew.

The most important of the newer works certainly include Rudolf Bultmann's huge Commentary in the Meyer series³ and C. H. Dodd's magnificent work, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*⁴; the latest full-length commentary is that of C. K. Barrett,⁵ which does not, however, take into account Dr. Dodd's work—the book was finished before Dodd's volume appeared. Mention should also be made of the important commentary by E. C. Hoskyns, edited by F. N. Davey.⁶ Since its aim is chiefly theological exposition it is not so important for our purpose as the others.

¹ This book was a war casualty; its plates were melted down for metal. But its place has now been taken by a larger work, *The Gospels, Their Origin and Their Growth*, Harper & Brothers, 1957 (London: Faber & Faber, 1959).

² Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.

³ Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1941 and later; new edition 1956.

⁴ Cambridge University Press, 1953.

⁵ The Macmillan Company, 1955.

⁶ London: Faber & Faber, 1939. For more recent work on John, see the very full bibliography and critique by Philippe H. Menoud, *L'Evangile de Jean: Études et Problèmes*, reprinted from *Recherches Bibliques*, Desclée de Brouwer, 1958, pp. 11-40.

FREDERICK C. GRANT, Th.D., D.S. Litt., D.C.L., L.H.D., is Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York City. He maintains that recent archeological discoveries do not discredit the dating and interpretation of the Fourth Gospel current a generation ago.

I

Dr. Bultmann's Commentary is characterized by the application of form-critical principles, especially in the reconstruction of the sources, and by the assumption that the background of the Gospel of John was not only a type of early Christian Gnosis (i.e. Docetism) but also of pre-Christian Gnosis of the Syrian or Oriental type. In his reconstruction of the sources, Bultmann exercises great freedom in rearranging the contents and order of the Gospel, especially of the *Redequelle* or poetic discourse which the author of John took over, reinterpreted and applied from a Christian point of view, and rearranged to fit the outline of Jesus' ministry. This is a considerable advance upon the rearrangements proposed earlier by James Moffatt, G. H. C. Macgregor and others, who were as a rule content with such slight "corrections" of John's present order as the shift of ch. 6 to precede ch. 5, and 15-16 to precede 14.

The assumed discourse source (*Redequelle* or RQ) was set forth consecutively by the late Burton Scott Easton in his study of Bultmann's work in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*.⁷ For the sake of literary effect, Easton retained the archaic language of the King James Version. As thus reconstructed, the "poem" reads very much like an early Gnostic discourse—in form (but only in form) somewhat like the originally Syriac *Hymn of the Soul* contained in the Acts of Thomas.⁸ Yet one scarcely can escape the impression pilloried in the German student satire: The original papyrus codex of the Fourth Gospel became brittle in time, and one day an angel carelessly dropped it on the heavenly floor where it broke into a thousand fragments. The angels were horrified, but God said to them, "Do not be troubled. I will soon raise up my servant Rudolf Bultmann, who will restore it to perfect order."

Typically scandalous and irreverent, like much German student satire, even when it involves beloved professors! But the impression which gave rise to the story is inescapable, and one wonders if the new order does not itself need to be "rearranged" or "restored." John was the kind of writer, a kind which is illustrated not only by Gnostics but by devotional writers in all ages and climes, whose sequences of thought are never wholly logical, but intuitional, associational, poetic, and repetitive; for examples, see the *Bhagavad Gita* or *The Imitation of Christ*. One thought suggests another,

⁷ Vol. LXV, 1946, pp. 143-156.

⁸ Sections 108-113. See A. A. Bevan, "The Hymn of the Soul," in *Texts and Studies*, Vol. V, 3, Cambridge University Press, 1897; F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, 218 ff.; and M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford University Press, 1924, pp. 411-415; the Greek text is in Lipsius and Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Vol. III, Leipzig, 1903, pp. 219 ff.

and this still another, in a kind of catena or meditative "chain" of great truths and insights; and often the third or fourth link is attached to the first or second, and so on; so that the result is not a logical "chain" at all, but an intricate web or tapestry of religious thought, all concerned with one central theme and all adumbrating it in one direction or another.

Dr. Bultmann's view of the Gnostic background of the Fourth Gospel can also be found in his recently translated *Theology of the New Testament*.⁹ An earlier essay of his, on the Religious-historical Background of the Prologue to the Gospel of John, was published in the *Festschrift* for Hermann Gunkel,¹⁰ and also deserves careful consideration in this connection. For Dr. Bultmann the Gnostic background was much older and more widespread than many other experts assume. He shares, apparently, the view of the late Paul Wendland, that "Gnosis was the theology of Syncretism."¹¹ It had already achieved a more or less fixed form before being taken over by groups of Christians, here and there, and made the intellectual pattern of their growing theology. He even assumes that the figure of the Redeemer was found in pre-Christian Gnosticism, a view sharply contested by A. D. Nock, Robert Casey, Gilles Quispel, Robert M. Grant, and others, who insist that the Redeemer is found only in Christian Gnosis.

But apart from this distinction (which is of course very important), the fact of the *general* atmosphere and background of the Johannine presentation of the gospel tradition is now taken for granted by an increasing number of interpreters. Even the enthusiasts for Qumrân, who attempt to derive the thought and language of John from the Dead Sea Scrolls, or from a type of religious thought closely allied to the one set forth in the Scrolls, must admit that both words, "Gnosticism" and "syncretism," are widely generic and inclusive, wide enough to include not only the thought of John and that of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but much else besides—Hermetism, for example, and the later Manicheism and Mandeism. Moreover, the latest researches in the history of early Gnosticism, as in Robert M. Grant's book, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*,¹² support the hypothesis that Gnosticism was really Jewish in origin, and represented a *metabasis* to another *genus* effected by religious thought when the apocalyptic hopes of Judaism were annihilated by the two unsuccessful wars against Rome in A.D. 66-70 and 132-135.

⁹ Translated by Kendrick Grobel; Vol. I, 1951, Vol. II, 1955. See sections 15, 41-50.

¹⁰ *Eucharistikon*, Göttingen, 1923, Vol. II, pp. 1-26. See also his *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*, Meridian Books, 1956.

¹¹ *Die Hellenistisch-römische Kultur*, 2d ed., 1912, ch. VIII. Cf. A. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed., 1909, Vol. I, pp. 243-292.

¹² Columbia University Press, 1959.

Hence the facile alternative, *either* Hellenism (i.e. Gnosticism) *or* the Dead Sea Scrolls, is almost meaningless. Qumrân certainly lay within the orbit of both Hellenistic and Oriental syncretism, and was affected by influences from outside strictly historical Judaism, i.e. the "normative" Judaism, as George Foot Moore called it,¹³ which was even then rising and moving toward its later crystallization in Mishnah and Talmud.

II

Dr. Dodd's book, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, is not a commentary but deals wholly with the background, leading ideas, argument and structure of John's Gospel: it is a work of introduction. At the end he adds a valuable appendix, "The Historical Aspect of the Fourth Gospel." According to Dr. Dodd, the background includes of course the primitive *kerygma*: Dodd stresses its importance just as Bultmann does in the opening chapters of his *Theology of the New Testament*. He then turns to "the higher religion of Hellenism," which he finds illustrated chiefly in the *Hermetica*, the quasi-Gnostic or (according to Martin P. Nilsson) pagan Gnostic writings from the second to the fourth century which combine traditional (especially Egyptian) mythology, Greek Neo-Orphic or Neo-Pythagorean, and popular Oriental, theosophical, "ancient wisdom" ideas with Jewish—especially those derived from the opening chapters of Genesis. The syncretistic character of this *mélange* is obvious; so are its parallels with John, and the availability of its Logos-conception for use by the fourth evangelist. Hellenistic Judaism is also a close parallel, especially as seen in Philo of Alexandria. This chapter may well be supplemented by Dr. Dodd's valuable book, *The Bible and the Greeks*,¹⁴ where he shows how important the vocabulary of Greek-speaking Jews, especially the Greco-Jewish writers of Alexandria, became for the writers of the New Testament and other early Christian literature. Rabbinic Judaism is investigated, too, for its parallels and its share in the general background of thought of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles.

Finally, Gnosticism and Mandaeism are considered, and the real, not superficial, affiliations are made clear. Back of these later types of religious thought, feeling, aspiration, and language certainly lay a long history—some of it going back, we believe, to early antiquity in Greece and Egypt. The stream of theosophical religious speculation had a very ancient origin, and

¹³ In two articles in the *Harvard Theological Review*, "The Rise of Normative Judaism," in Oct. 1924 and Jan. 1925. These articles preceded the appearance of his classic work, *Judaism* (1927).

¹⁴ London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

sometimes flowed underground—but kept on flowing, until it emerged, a river in size, in the second and third and later centuries. According to Dr. Dodd, while the fourth evangelist stood “within the general environment of primitive Christianity, and may have been in some measure influenced by Paul, he also shows affinities with certain tendencies in non-Christian thought. He is well aware of the teaching of Rabbinic Judaism, but only partly sympathetic to it. . . . Rabbinic Judaism, Philo and the *Hermetica* remain the most direct sources for the background of thought, and in each case the distinctive character of Johannine Christianity is brought out by observing the transformation it wrought in ideas which it holds in common with other forms of religion.”¹⁵

Part II of the work proceeds to study the leading religious concepts used in the Fourth Gospel: Symbolism, Eternal Life, Knowledge of God, Truth, Faith, Union with God, Light, Glory, Judgment, Spirit, Messiah, Son of Man, Son of God, Logos. Each one of these conceptions is studied in relation to its antecedents, cognate ideas, and consequences for the evangelist’s total thought-world. If anyone suspects he is being carried away into some strange land of “Hellenistic syncretism,” let it be said at once that the whole idea of revelation, in the Old Testament, “is determined by the analogy of the word spoken and heard, as distinct from the idea of revelation as vision”¹⁶—the latter idea is often found in Greek religion. The presupposition of the Logos-doctrine is constant throughout the Gospel. The Prologue is no merely decorative literary ornament hung over the gateway to the Gospel: it is an integral and fundamental element in John’s whole conception of Christ.

Part III deals with the argument and structure of the Fourth Gospel and begins with its clear and obvious divisions: The Prologue, John the Baptist’s testimony (ch. 1), the Book of the Seven Signs (ch. 2-12), the Book of the Passion (ch. 13-20) including the two Farewell Discourses at the Last Supper (ch. 14-16), the great High Priestly Prayer (ch. 17), and the Passion Narrative (ch. 18-20). The Gospel ends with ch. 20—“the rest, however true and however moving, is mere postscript.”¹⁷

The structure of the Gospel does not enable us to distinguish sharply the historical and the didactic elements in it; for though the historical sections are in the forefront in ch. 1 and ch. 18-20, they are introduced

¹⁵ Dodd, C. H., *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge, 1953, p. 133.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 263.

¹⁷ p. 443. In general this is also the outline of my commentary in *Harper’s Annotated Bible*, and, as my students will recognize, one which I have used during many years of teaching the course on the Fourth Gospel.

incidentally and not always very seriously in the discourse chapters. This does not apply to the seven "signs"—the great Johannine miracles beginning with the wine at Cana and ending with the stupendous raising of Lazarus; these two, as someone has said, and the other Johannine miracles as well, are manifestations of *creative divine power*. As John's contemporaries surely would have described them, they are such miracles as only a god could perform. And yet they are narrated in as simple and matter-of-fact a way as those in the Synoptics. Indeed, some scholars have tried to set the form-critical limits of the underlying traditional pericopes. In several cases this is quite feasible, especially in those stories which have parallels in the Synoptics. Even the story of the man born blind has a very simple narrative base (9:1-3, 6-7).

Hence our effort to recover the historical element in John must operate at three levels: (1) the old oral tradition, of a quasi-Synoptic type; (2) the elaborated and reinterpreted (especially symbolically reinterpreted) tradition found in ch. 1 and in the Passion Narrative, and also here and there in the intervening chapters and in the Appendix; finally, (3) the historical *ideas*, traceable to the original teaching of Jesus (e.g. spiritual rebirth, equivalent to becoming like little children in the Synoptics) or at least to the church's primitive teaching, according to which Jesus' death was for the salvation of men (e.g. 12:32, "I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself"—a saying which combines the primitive kerygma of the cross with the eschatological expectation of Christ's glorification and heavenly reign), but which is now set forth in a new frame of thought, a new vocabulary, and a different world outlook. In bringing out the symbolical value of events in the gospel tradition, John "used some freedom,"¹⁸ trying to find the *whole meaning* of Christ's life, teaching, manifestation of God, death, and resurrection in the particular incident he is presenting. It is like the dewdrop reflecting the whole sky. This method of interpretation, according to Dr. Dodd, does not exceed "the limits proper to history."¹⁹ Such a stripping away of the meaning—or interpretation—which John either finds in the narratives or gives to them, as is done in modern "thoroughgoing eschatology," is really an impoverishment of the tradition, of its very facts; for (as Dodd argued in his *History and the Gospel*²⁰) the *meaning* is an essential part of any tradition. Tradition gets handed down only because it means something.

¹⁸ p. 444.

¹⁹ p. 445.

²⁰ Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938.

Specifically, in one part of the Gospel (6:1—7:1) there is a sequence which seems almost to shadow the Marcan order—a striking correlation²¹ with a section of Mark which seems to contain doublets of still older tradition, and where Mark (for a part of the way) seems to be using two parallel strands, each with its own account of a series of incidents (Mk. 6:30—7:37, 8:1-26). This is one more indication²² of underlying structures and sequences derived from the old oral tradition, or from “the gospel before the Gospels,” to use Burton Easton’s suggestive formula. This does not mean that John is dependent upon the Synoptics: ever since the appearance of P. Gardner-Smith’s *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels*,²³ many scholars have hesitated to assume that John knew any of the Synoptics; the literary contacts are either such as belong to any telling of the story, or are almost irrelevant or accidental and belong to the mere fringe of the narrative. As Dr. Dodd concludes, “The *prima facie* impression is that John is, in large measure at any rate, working independently of other written gospels.”²⁴ His old tradition is like that of Mark (and to some degree that of Luke and Matthew), but not identical with it; it has come down to him by another channel, and some of it is “of a character so different that it is difficult to institute a comparison.” Likewise the topographical data²⁵ (Cana, Samaria, Sychar, Ephraim, Bethabara, Bethany) and some of the persons (Nicodemus, Nathanael, the woman at the well)—are these mere fictional adornments of the story?

This would be hard to believe! The only way by which we can *use* the data of the Fourth Gospel, it seems to me, is to assume (with the late Maurice Goguel and others) that the unique peculiar tradition in John is basically sound tradition, though it has been greatly modified and often reinterpreted, either in transmission or by the author of the Gospel; and that wherever possible, without doing violence to the Synoptic tradition, it should be incorporated with the latter; recognizing (a) that fundamentally the Synoptic *narrative* tradition is Mark’s, and (b) that the life, teaching, personal relations, influence, and whole impact of Jesus upon his generation must have been much wider than the rather bare account in Mark would lead us to suppose. Dr. Dodd concludes that “the pre-canonical tradition lying behind the *prima facie* historical statements of the Fourth Gospel”

²¹ *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 448.

²² For others, see my book, *The Gospels, Their Origin and Their Growth*, 1957, ch. VIII.

²³ Cambridge University Press, 1938.

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 449.

²⁵ See Karl Kundzina, *Topologische Ueberlieferungsstoffe im Johannesevangelium*, Göttingen, 1925. Cf. Bacon, Benjamin W., *The Gospel of the Hellenists*, Henry Holt & Company, 1933, pp. 397-409.

may perhaps be identified, and combined with other data, either from the Synoptic Gospels or "from sources outside the Gospels altogether."²⁶

III

The words were almost prophetic! In the *Festschrift* for Dr. Dodd published in 1956, *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, William F. Albright contributed an essay, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of John."²⁷ In an appendix to the last volume of *The Interpreter's Bible*, Frank M. Cross deals with parallels to the New Testament, especially to John, found in the Dead Sea manuscripts.²⁸ And in *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (edited by Krister Stendahl), Raymond E. Brown, S.S., writes Ch. XII, "The Qumrân Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles."²⁹ These three incisive essays may be singled out from the deluge of writing on the Scrolls—the bibliography now runs to thousands of titles!—as representative discussions of one of these "sources outside the Gospels," at least as understood by many readers of the Scrolls. They provide a good introduction, for most readers, to the Scrolls and their interpretation.

For the texts themselves, in English translation, and for the story of their discovery and identification, the work of Millar Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Viking Press, 1955) is already a classic, translated into several languages. It is now supplemented by his *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1958). See also the translation and notes on the Scrolls in Theodor H. Gaster's *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (1956), which has appeared as a Doubleday Anchor Book. And see also Géza Vermès, *Discovery in the Judean Desert* (Desclee, 1956), which has a historical introduction, translation, notes, and illustrations.

Some less temperate writers have made quite extravagant and inadmissible claims for the Scrolls, e.g. that they indicate that the whole approach to the New Testament and to the rise of Christianity, the chronological sequence of the New Testament literature and its historical evaluation, must be entirely changed—since John is now seen to be early, rather than late (previously viewed as the latest Gospel, now the earliest!); Palestinian in origin, and Judean, with strong ties to the South, Judea, the Judean desert, Qumrân, and Samaria; with John the Baptist and the Essenes, and the

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 453.

²⁷ Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge University Press, 1956, pp. 153-171.

²⁸ Abingdon Press, 1957, Vol. XII, pp. 660 ff.

²⁹ Harper & Brothers, 1957; chapter reprinted from the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, XVII, 1955, pp. 403 ff., 559 ff.

priestly clique in Jerusalem—and so on. The argument is very neat, and reminds one of Westcott's famous concentric circles: the author of the Fourth Gospel was a Jew, a Palestinian Jew, a Galilean, a disciple, the beloved disciple, the son of Zebedee, *John!*³⁰ It is like other famous apologetic works, e.g. *A Short and Simple Method With Dissenters*, popular (in some circles!) a century ago. But the wish is all too obviously the father to the thought: *John must be made early, and authentic, at all costs!* For many readers of the Bible besides Barrett Wendell³¹—and since his time—*John is the favorite Gospel, and they would gladly keep it and let the others go, if necessary.* For example, the late Albert T. Olmstead, writing as an ancient historian, held that the Johannine Passion Narrative was comprehensible as a historical document, on all fours both with the probabilities of the case and with ancient procedure, both Roman and Jewish; while in the light of ancient history and law the Synoptic Passion Narrative was “simply crazy.”³²

The chief protagonists of this revolutionary view of the date and provenance of *John* are philologists and archaeologists, for whom, apparently, the discarding of two centuries of New Testament research and the conclusions of several generations of a broader scholarship than linguistics and archaeology is a simple matter: the whole structure can be rebuilt in a week or two! Their arguments have weight, it appears, chiefly with those whose knowledge of ancient Jewish writings is limited to the Scrolls, and of ancient Greek writings to the New Testament. In view of the present low level of theological education, and of pre-theological, this is hardly surprising. The readers have no criteria by which to test the sweeping statements they read.

But the parallels between the Dead Sea Scrolls and *John* must be studied in the light of hundreds of already existing and well-known parallels—such as those collected by Drs. Dodd and Bultmann,³³ Walter Bauer,³⁴ Strack and Billerbeck,³⁵ Julius Grill,³⁶ H. J. Holtzmann,³⁷ Bishop

³⁰ For example in the Introduction to his *Commentary* published in London, 1908.

³¹ *The Traditions of European Literature*, New York, 1920.

³² Olmstead, A. T., *Jesus in the Light of History*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1942. His criticism of the Synoptic Passion Narrative, especially its account of the trial of Jesus, was made orally at a meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis at Union Theological Seminary in 1938, and was reported in *Time* the following week.

³³ In his *Commentary*.

³⁴ In his *Commentary* in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 3d ed., 1933.

³⁵ In their vast *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 5 vols., Munich, 1922-28, Index vol., 1956.

³⁶ *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des Vierten Evangeliums*, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1902, 1923.

³⁷ In the *Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. IV, Tübingen, 1908.

Westcott,³⁸ and many others, all the way back to John Lightfoot in 1658,³⁹ J. J. Wetstein in 1751,⁴⁰ Christian Kuinoel in 1794,⁴¹ and August Wünsche in 1878.⁴² One wonders if those who are waving banners for a "revolution in New Testament study" have ever worked through, page by page and reference by reference, such a commentary as Walter Bauer's in Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*. If one does this, it will be evident to him that the parallels found in the Dead Sea Scrolls are only a few more among hundreds, and not very close ones at that. We already knew many which are far closer than any thus far discovered at Qumrân.

Moreover, the contrast between "Jewish" and "Hellenistic" elements or features, ideas or terminology, is false: all of first-century Judaism, even in Palestine, belonged inside the world of Greco-Roman-Oriental Hellenism or Syncretism, and none of it escaped some influence, weak or strong, from outside sources. No province in the Roman Empire was more fully Hellenized and Romanized than Syria. The use of the Greek language and the presence of Greek ideas in ancient Palestine has been fully demonstrated by Saul Lieberman,⁴³ though naturally the evidence is ampler for the second century than for the first. But we have known these facts for a long time: Emil Schürer recognized them;⁴⁴ the editors of the Greek inscriptions knew them;⁴⁵ Eduard Meyer stressed the varied and polymorphic character of the "fringe sects" in ancient Judaism;⁴⁶ Moriz Friedländer⁴⁷ and Gerald Friedlander⁴⁸ and Norman Bentwich⁴⁹ wrote books to prove it. Only the archaeologists—i.e. the two or three who are loudest in calling for revolution—seem never to have examined this evidence until the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered.

³⁸ In his *Commentary* published posthumously in 1908.

³⁹ *Horae Hebraeae et Talmudicae*, new ed., Oxford, 1859, edited by Robert Gandell of the Queen's College. See Vol. III.

⁴⁰ *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, Amsterdam, 2 vols., 1751-52.

⁴¹ *Observations ad Novum Testamentum ex Libris Apocryphis V.T.*, Leipzig, apud Joh. Theoph. Feindium, 1794.

⁴² *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Göttingen, 1878.

⁴³ Lieberman, Saul, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, 1942; *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 1950 (both New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America).

⁴⁴ *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed., 3 vols., Leipzig, 1901, 1907, 1909.

⁴⁵ For example, Wilhelm Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1903-05; W. K. Prentice, *Greek and Latin Inscriptions*, Pt. III of *Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900*, New York, 1908. See also E. S. Bouchier, *Syria as a Roman Province*, Oxford, 1915, and Franz Cumont in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. XI, 1936, ch. 15, "The Frontier Provinces of the East."

⁴⁶ In his *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1921-23.

⁴⁷ *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu*, Berlin, 1905.

⁴⁸ *Hellenism and Christianity*, London, 1912.

⁴⁹ *Philo-Judeus of Alexandria*, Philadelphia, 1910.

IV

For example, the contrast between light and darkness, truth and error, is as old as the Semitic religions—and the Egyptian—and was strongly reinforced by the Persian, especially perhaps during the long two centuries when the Persian Empire dominated western Asia and included Anatolia and Thrace, Egypt, Libya, and Cyrenaica. The terms are cardinal in Mazdaism, the Persian state religion, and are perfectly well known in the Old Testament, especially in II Isaiah.⁵⁰ The Greeks were more impressed with Persian truth-telling than with any other quality in their character. The ethical stress—and even the metaphysical—on truth versus the lie, light versus the darkness, had been carried far and wide in western Asia during those centuries from 538 to 331 B.C.

Or take the words for spiritual or religious “knowledge,” another Old Testament commonplace:⁵¹ both John and the Dead Sea Scrolls tap a source or sources far older than either—the language was not only common, it was typical and characteristic of the traditional Jewish religion, which stressed the knowledge of God, and God’s knowledge of man, as no other religion in antiquity ever did. One of the oldest benedictions in the *Shemoneh Esreh*, the daily prayer said by all devout Jews, was the fourth, dating presumably from about the lifetime of Jesus (according to the modern experts in Jewish liturgical study⁵²). It runs:

Bless us, our Father, with the knowledge (*daath*) that cometh from Thee.

Again, the “Essene” community (if Qumrân was Essene) stressed its own unity.⁵³ This is no doubt parallel to the emphasis in John (e.g. 17:11, 21, 23); but back of both is the Old Testament (e.g. Zech. 14:9) and also the daily *Shema* and the daily synagogue prayer, known by heart and used by every faithful Jew, Benediction 18 of the *Shemoneh Esreh*:

Send forth Thy peace upon Israel, Thy people,
And bless us all as one . . .

(*kullanu k'ekadîh*; the Qumrân word is *hayakid*, from the same Hebrew root.)

⁵⁰ See Isa. 45:6f., where Yahweh’s superiority to the god of light and truth in a divided world of truth versus lies, light versus darkness, is finely brought out: “I am the Lord, and there is no other. I form light and create darkness.” Cf. vs. 19: “If the Lord speak the truth, I declare what is right.” In 65:16 he is the “God of truth.”

⁵¹ See Isa. 11:9, I Sam. 2:3, Job 36:5, Ps. 119:66, Mal. 2:7.

⁵² See my article, “Modern Study of the Jewish Liturgy,” in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Vol. LXV (1953), pp. 59-77, with bibliography appended to the exposition of these modern views.

⁵³ The Dead Sea *Manual of Discipline*, col. 5, lines 2, 7.

Again, the reference to the Creation in the Manual of Discipline (11:11), which by the way the experts do not agree in translating:

By His knowledge has everything been brought into being,
And everything that is, He established by His purpose,
And apart from Him it is not done,

sounds very much like the opening verses of John (1:1-3). But the parallels with Psalm 33:6 and 104:24 are far closer; for "knowledge" is not the same thing as "wisdom," nor is either the equivalent of *logos*—certainly not of the *Logos*.

By the word of the Lord the heavens were made,
and all their host by the breath of his mouth.
(Ps. 33:6 RSV)

O Lord, how manifold are thy works!
In wisdom hast thou made them all;
the earth is full of thy creatures.

(Ps. 104:24 RSV)

Nor must the parallels, few though fairly close as they are, close our eyes to the vast gulf which separates the Dead Sea Scrolls from the Gospels, chiefly in ethical outlook. The "War Scroll" is well named—and might almost have sprung from the ranks of the Arabs as they set forth under the banners of Islam to conquer the world! Or it might have been the screed of the Mahdi; or—not impossibly—the fantastic manifesto of those last-ditch rebels in the revolt against Rome who died, with their families, at nearby Masada after the fall of the capital; or of those miserable victims, also described by Josephus, who were crucified along the Judean roads following the debacle, and who died there in agony with their faces turned toward the distant still smouldering ruins of the temple.

The Dead Sea Scrolls do not shed much light upon the Gospels—including John—or upon the life and teaching of Jesus. But they help us to realize more fully not only the great varieties in outlook to be found within first-century Judaism, and its penetration by the widespread and popular dualistic Oriental syncretism of the age, but also the fatal political situation, from which the Qumrân monks had fled but which no Jew could escape, anywhere. For eventually it overtook and destroyed not only the Jewish state, and the holy city, and the sacred temple, but even the remote wilderness refuge at Khirbet Qumrân.

Store-Front Religion

G. NORMAN EDDY

ONE SUNDAY MORNING I was walking in Boston's South End when I happened to pass several poor men sitting on benches in what could not be called a city park. I stopped when I heard the loud voice of a young man preaching to these derelicts. I heard, and then I looked. This young man wore a gaily printed blanket wrapped over one shoulder and around his waist and legs. The bare shoulder, the sparse beard, the untrimmed flowing hair would have stopped anyone with an ounce of curiosity—so, I looked and listened. As he exhorted with his loud voice, he frequently raised his hand aloft in dramatic gesture before swinging it down with a loud clap on the back of a Bible which he held in his other hand. This movement served to punctuate every other sentence of his sermon with a percussive rhythm. His style of speech was uninhibited by any sort of practical homiletical restrictions; rather, it consisted of a series of thundered exclamations and imperatives. He was concerned with "the sorry state of sinful man"; he demanded that all should "find refuge in the Almighty before the frightful consequences of sin befall you." Then, just as abruptly as he had begun, he ceased speaking—but not before he gave us explicit directions for locating his store-front sanctuary where we might all find salvation.

On later occasions I visited his church and again listened to his explosive preaching. His audiences were never particularly large—perhaps as many as a dozen besides myself. The furnishings, like the services, were quite simple. There was a small, box-like platform; a table for the large, old-fashioned pulpit Bible; some placards of biblical quotations crudely printed by the minister himself; a naked light bulb hanging over a few folding chairs. . . . No large auditorium seemed necessary for this group. A simple "store-front" served its purposes quite well.

Perhaps this eccentric minister will serve to call attention to an ecclesiastical domain which may be found in certain areas of almost every large urban community. The preachers—like their sermons and congrega-

G. NORMAN EDDY, Ph.D., is Professor of Human Relations and Chairman of the Department, in the College of General Education, Boston University, Boston, Mass. Dr. Eddy's article is part of a work in progress on American Minority Religions.

tions—will vary somewhat, one from the other. But these groups all share one thing in common: their use of a store-front auditorium.

Usually the windows of such a place are painted over, while one or more outside signs give the time that services are held. In addition there may be a blackboard on the sidewalk on which has been printed "Jesus Saves," or "The Wages of Sin Is Death." Then again, there will be other signs tacked to the window frames inviting all to come inside to be saved of their sins or to be healed of their infirmities. Those stopping to listen outside will hear the noisy singing and the raucous preaching characteristic of the store-front church.

A more precise definition, however, would be of some value. More formally, I mean by this term "store-front religion" those groups found in the socially disorganized areas of large urban communities and generally housed in small secular buildings. These faiths are characterized by a more or less marked deviation from that of any established religious body. They differ in many ways from the denominations and ecclesia; specifically, in the relatively meager education of their clergy, in the lower economic stratification of their congregations, in the bizarre nature of their theology, and in their unpretentious store-front meeting places. Marked contrasts with the more traditional religious bodies are apparent both in their ritual and in their social and psychological objectives. Store-front religions range all the way from ephemeral groups to those which have a history of two or more generations. Some of these groups are entirely independent, but a majority have at least a loose affiliation with other groups in an ecclesiastical organization. There are those which have store-front places of worship in several cities and one imposing church edifice in another. All store-front groups, however, are characterized by the marginal, social, and economic status of their congregations. For a number of years I have sought to familiarize myself with some of these lesser known religious groups. I have attempted to learn something of their character and the role which this plays in the lives of these believers.

Because of their variety, it is a formidable task to attempt any statistically accurate classification. However, I find three basic types. The first of these is the transitory local group. Usually, this group is emotional in character and does not have strong interchurch affiliations. The second type is "charismatic"; that is, it is the creation of a forceful leader who is able to sustain the loyalty of small bodies of people in several cities. And finally, there is a third type arising from a myth which unifies people socially by giving them a distinctive ritual and belief. While these divisions

do not embrace all store-front groups and are not entirely self-exclusive, they do provide a workable framework for describing the essential characteristics of such bodies. The succeeding sections will describe three representative groups falling into these basic categories: (1) a primitive Pentacostal church; (2) *The House of Prayer*; and (3) *The Church of God and Saints of Christ* (also known as *The Black Jews*).

I. TRANSITORY LOCAL GROUPS

Careful observations over a period of years support the thesis that the number of store-front type buildings used for worship remains just about constant. Despite this, there is much evidence that the *churches* (i.e., the organized bodies of people, themselves) constitute a very transitory phenomenon. They spring into being and dissolve again with a certain degree of regularity. Most of them are local in character since they are often the result of schismatic tension. Perhaps some church member has become offended by a particular doctrine being preached by his minister. Having the egotistic desire to preach, he may decide to organize a church of his own with those disgruntled members he is able to entice away from the original congregation. Since funds are usually very low, a store front provides a possible meeting place. After a longer or shorter period of vitality, the church frequently succumbs to economic or social pressures and another group takes its place.

The cyclical character of many store-front groups may be suggested by the following example. For several months I attended services in a rickety old building which displayed the sign *Pentacostal Church of Hope* crudely painted over the door. The minister, who referred to himself as Elder A., was converted three or four years earlier during the evangelistic services of a store-front group in another neighborhood. Elder A., an unskilled laborer, was about thirty-five years old, with a tall, thin, ascetic-looking frame. He had little formal education, and as he told me, had spent a wicked youth. He had drunk excessively, committed adultery, and brought disgrace both upon his family and himself. His conversion made for a radical change in his life. Not only was his entire outlook modified, but he sought for and received the "*deeper blessing*" of the Holy Spirit—i.e., he spoke in tongues and he danced in ecstasy before the Lord.

As a result, his passion for religious dedication knew no bounds. To remain a mere layman in another's church would not provide him with sufficient scope for his religious aspirations. He must preach. He felt himself called upon by the Lord, and preach he did. A sister's home where

he was living provided the location for his first efforts, with members of her family and neighborhood friends making up the congregation. In this second-floor apartment opening off a dark hallway in an ancient tenement house, there was much shouting and praising of the Lord. Some received the gift of the Holy Spirit and testified in unknown tongues. But since not all the tenants in this dingy building were sympathetic to this type of religious worship, some became irate at the shaking of tambourines, the loud singing, and the jumping. There were services every night in the week, and sometimes these would continue until very late.

Eventually there was a complaint to the police, and as a result, they were ordered to desist. A store front seemed to be the only solution for their need of a new meeting place. Yet the congregation never exceeded more than thirty—and even this figure included some children. I got to know these people well enough to realize how difficult it was for them to raise the money for the piano, the folding chairs, and the monthly rent. I became inured to the pastor's impassioned pleas for even larger contributions. These were poor people and the outside pressure on them was strong. I returned one Sunday to find the church disbanded and a For Rent sign on the door. Altogether, the life span of this church had been something less than two years. Yet almost immediately after this group's failure, the building was occupied by another store-front group called "*The Holiness Church of Christ*."

Throughout the United States, there must be thousands of these little churches. What is their appeal? Why do these people worship in uncomfortable buildings when the denominational churches have more than enough room for them? Undoubtedly the answers to these questions are complex, yet three factors seem to be of particular importance: these groups provide (1) a sense of status to the member, (2) assurance of spiritual healing, (3) opportunity for emotional expression.

The need for recognition is fundamental to most human motivation. It is only natural that persons of low economic status—who do not have the opportunity of participating in the expensive means of secular self-expression—should turn to the church to satisfy this need for recognition. Yet why is it that these people cannot gratify their wants in the larger churches? I asked two or three why they didn't attend an imposing church only a block from where they worshiped. One reply was, "Who would we be over there?" They gave other answers, too—many of them theological; but I suspect that this was the real answer. Over at the other, larger church, they would have to compete with persons of considerably higher status—

both economic and social. In the store front, they would be with their peers.

To the outsider, there are many things about these store-front groups which seem disorganized. The time to begin or end a meeting appears to be almost a matter of indifference. In addition, there is much informality about both the sermon and the order of the service. But never is the importance of status overlooked. There is an organizational position for each which gives most of them a real sense of importance. In a church of, say, thirty members, where every individual is some kind of officer, things might, to the outsider, seem ridiculously over-organized. Yet for the office holders, there is nothing the least bit ridiculous in such an organizational system.

For instance, one of the older women in churches of this type is often selected as *Church Mother*. During the services, she will sit just below the pulpit where she will face the congregation from her honored position. During the testimony period, each member of the group will begin by giving thanks for his church, his pastor, and his church mother. I was told that her primary task was that of counselor. Young people may take their problems to her and she will reward them with her sage advice. You might suppose that a special office would be unnecessary. However, this overlooks the honored status, the feeling of importance and recognition which this duty gives the woman. The office of Church Mother is but one of a great variety of obscure offices within such groups. All have the purpose of making the individual feel a sense of his own importance within the group.

Religion is something extremely vital and real to store-front people. It is quite literally a "very present help in time of trouble." To illustrate this point, I have frequently been amazed by the responses of the congregation when the pastor asks the members to request a prayer to aid a sick relative or friend. Almost all have relatives or friends with afflictions requiring the healing hand of God. More important than earthly doctors to such people are the prayers of the faithful. Regardless of their effectiveness, faith healings are practiced continuously, with the pastors of many groups known for their healing powers. I have had the opportunity to witness some of the methods.

One Sunday after church service I was talking with the pastor of a store-front group when a young man came up to us. He asked the minister to heal his seven-year-old daughter who was suffering from whooping-cough. The father was afraid that his other children might become infected from his little girl. The minister asked me if I would like

to go along with him on his call and I was only too happy to accept his invitation. I remember the very professional manner in which he spoke to the parents when we entered the home: "We'll have to lick this thing right away before it gets any further. . . ." He then took a small vial of oil from his pocket, poured some on the child's head and then gave a brief prayer. That was all. The mother and father thanked him for his help and seemed to have complete confidence that their daughter would be cured. I never did hear if the girl recovered.

Yet equally significant to these people is the emotional release provided by their church. So important is this factor that church attendance occupies practically all of their free time. Emotionalism charges their testimony services and their singing as well as the sermons. In a typical store-front group, there are a few young people but the majority are middle-aged or older. When they come in, many of them look haggard and beaten. Somebody—perhaps the deacon or the minister's wife—will begin a song. The drums, tambourines, piano and the washboard (played with a claw hammer) take up a musical accompaniment. Everybody sings and claps hands to the rhythm. A few stamp their feet. Vibrations from the music swell through the body. Their gospel songs are rollicking jingles with endless stanzas.

He'll never let you down
He'll never let you down
Though storms may come and
Winds may blow,
He'll never let you down.

A jubilant atmosphere charged with deep feeling becomes inspired by the rhythm. This joyous feeling is contagious.

In one such group, a fat woman of about thirty began moving unsteadily on her feet, raised her hands heavenward, rolled expressionless eyes, threw back her head convulsively, screeched "Halleluiah!" Her feet picked up the rhythm of the washboard, moving faster and faster in these moments of religious ecstasy. She moved to the center of the floor while the pastor and the others clapped their hands with ever increasing tempo. Suddenly she reached a climax and fell to the floor, thrashing about wildly. She muttered words impossible to understand. A blanket kept for the purpose was thrown over her until she relinquished her *gift*. Meanwhile, the singing continued as it had before.

In the beliefs of these people, this has been a *gift* from the Holy Spirit. In the words of the pastor's sermon, "A man has not become truly

religious until he has humbled himself before the Lord by rolling on the floor, unashamed in the dust and the dirt. . . ." Not many receive the gift. I have asked some, "Have you had the gift of the Holy Spirit?" Often enough, the answer has been, "No," although they hasten to add that they are looking forward to it, or that they are trying to live so that the gift will be vouchsafed to them. Whether or not they undergo this experience, it is apparent that all have derived some ecstatic release from this kind of worship. In it they discover an opportunity to lose their sense of frustration and failure in the everyday world. And these people, with this fervid cathartic experience, typify most transitory local groups.

II. THE CHARISMATIC GROUP

On the white-painted glass windows of a decrepit old store front are lettered rather crudely the following words, which I copied down exactly:

God has only one true house with one true name—the Bible says even then will I bring to my holy mountain and make them joyful in my House of Prayer. Is 56 7.

The church is not brick and wood, but people baptized with the Holy Ghost and Fire who shout, speak with other tongues, like the Bible says. We all must do this before we can be saved.

God's grace is a man. Titus 2 11. For the Grace of God bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men. Titus 2 12.

Although it may not be immediately apparent, these three sentences summarize the basis of the "charismatic" store-front religion: (1) a particular place of worship, (2) a particular type of worship, and (3) a "divinely appointed" leader. The particular store-front meeting place from which the above quotations were obtained is especially conscious of this third factor, for it is the local branch of a national faith which is the creation of an extraordinary man who refers to himself as Bishop C. M. Grace—but who is known to his followers more affectionately as "Daddy" Grace. Because such groups as his publish little and make no serious effort to keep accurate statistics, it is almost impossible to say how many local *Houses of Prayer* (as his worship places are known) there are. It has been estimated that there are more than a hundred local groups which extend all the way from Massachusetts to Florida with over a half-million followers.

Bishop C. M. Grace is an example of what many sociologists would call a "charismatic" leader. Such a person is thought to have a divine gift for solving the most pressing problems and for working the most astounding miracles. His followers say, "We believe in the Father, in the Son, in the

Holy Ghost, and in Bishop C. M. Grace"—but it seems to me that Daddy Grace is a more real deity to them than the Trinity. Indeed, one of his ardent followers told me that Jesus is gone now and it's easier to call on Daddy Grace. There are many reasons to believe that this comment is indicative of the divine status his followers believe Bishop Grace fills. On one occasion I listened to some of his group praying fervently for a friend who was ill—to Daddy Grace. At the time, Daddy Grace was in another city some distance away, and so I asked them, "Do you really think that your prayers will be answered?" Almost immediately they replied, "Certainly. Daddy always knows when we pray to him. He knows everything we need and he always helps us."

Once I asked him outright if he were God. In reply, he said somewhat evasively, "Some people say that I am." But whatever he may think about himself, his followers give every evidence of their worshipful regard. In his sanctuaries, he is pictured in the flowing robes associated with Christ. Upon the bishop's breast is depicted a bleeding sacred heart. At each meeting the people express their thanks to "sweet Daddy Grace" over and over again. They say, "Ain't he wonderful? Isn't he sweet?" To them, he is their God.

In the restaurant which is connected with the Harlem sanctuary there is a special table placed on a platform apart from the other tables. This is where the Bishop eats when he is in New York. There are expensive dishes and silver on a snowy-white tablecloth. Here his followers gather around to watch the great man as he eats. Sometimes with a playful gesture he will toss little bits of bread to them. These crumbs are eagerly sought after because of the miraculous power attributed to them. Once in a conversation with the Bishop, I happened to mention that a member of my family was ill. He responded to this by giving me a fragment of the toast which he had been eating and told me of its healing power.

The Bishop himself is a large, thick-set man—probably between sixty-five and seventy years of age. His eyes are dark, penetrating and commanding. He wears his hair long and outlines his carefully trimmed moustache with black make-up pencil. On his fingers he wears ornate and expensive rings. The nails of the fingers of his left hand have been allowed to grow five or six inches long and have been decorated with an intricate design by means of a multicolored nail polish. His clothing is equally unique. Usually he wears a light gray cutaway coat, and trousers with an inch-wide stripe of white piping along the sides. On his hand-painted ties he hangs a large, ornate cross.

The Bishop is fond of opulence. I was his guest in one of his palatial homes—a dark, prepossessing nineteenth-century residence ornamented with cupolas and turrets. This mansion is surrounded with spacious lawns and formal gardens, and inside there is a private chapel with an altar and candles, and a white marble oversized bust of the Bishop. Servants in uniform wait upon him, while out in his large garage expensive chauffeur-driven automobiles await his use.

In his own thinking, as will be seen from the following quotation, Bishop Grace is some sort of Noah sent to save the righteous from the catastrophe which is soon to come. When all have been given the opportunity to accept the faith, then Jesus will reappear.

There is one true religion, that of the House of Prayer. This was the faith of antiquity embraced by the great ones of old, including Jesus. It was lost in the dark ages, but it is being restored to the modern world by me. It welcomes all people whether black or white. The multiplicity of religions which are found today is an abomination in the eyes of God. These are the last days before the advent of Jesus Christ. The wicked are soon to be destroyed.

The sanctuaries for the House of Prayer range all the way from a large business-block establishment in Harlem to the crudest, most dilapidated sort of store fronts in some of the smaller Eastern-seaboard cities. Yet among all those sanctuaries which I have visited, I have found the following things in common: There is always a platform supporting a large, comfortable-looking throne chair (surrounded by vases of artificial flowers) and a pulpit with microphones—all for the exclusive use of the Bishop. No one else ever stands on the platform. During Daddy Grace's long absence from the local churches, protective plastic covers are used to shield the objects on the platform. All around the walls on large placards are displayed the Bishop's sayings intermixed with pictures of his homes and other sanctuaries. In every meeting place there can be seen a large photograph of El Dorado, which is reputed to be the largest apartment house in the world and which is said to be owned by Bishop Grace. On the platform itself, are large, life-sized cutouts of him. He is, without doubt, the author of their faith.

Of all the emotional groups I have known, this is the most extreme. The quite informal ritual consists of singing, testimony, marching, and compulsive dancing. There are services every night in the week, and from sunrise to midnight on Sundays. I was told that on Saturday night the faithful frequently become so much involved in worship that they continue through until one or two o'clock Sunday morning. Since little time is

left to go home, the group just stays there to catch a few hours of sleep on the church benches. In this way they will be all ready for the sunrise services.

Perhaps the most distinctive thing about their services is the frenzied congregational participation. After a brief period of spontaneous singing, the young and old line up to take their turn at the microphone to offer testimony. It may be a long or short effort, but occasionally it becomes so emotional that a few lose control of themselves completely. Others start to clap their hands while the speaker moves around and around in ever-increasing tempo until eventually he jumps high off the floor. He throws back his head as if from a violent spasm. His actions are contagious and those waiting in line to offer their testimony begin to imitate him. If the Bishop is present at these occasions, he will simply sit there with an expression of benign indifference on his face. Sometimes, however, a member has to be restrained lest he injure himself. The emotional pitch of the audience must constantly reach toward greater and greater heights or else it will die away as quickly as it came into being. But after a period of relative calm, the audience may be aroused again by almost any portion of the ritual—a grand march, a chorus, or the remarks of the minister. For these people, direct emotional expression is the essence of religion. It is this expression which stirs them so that they feel they have been in touch with the Holy Spirit.

I have attended a considerable number of these services in various Houses of Prayer and have often speculated on the mechanisms essential to their appeal. It seems apparent that certain of the principles of dynamic psychology have a place in any explanation. These are poor people. In the face of an unappreciative and sometimes hostile social order, many such people unconsciously wish to regress. And it is clear that regression is an accepted form of behavior in the House of Prayer. Members may jump and shout and clap their hands together gleefully—like a child, without fear of censure. In the House of Prayer it is not always necessary to use the language of grown-ups—the speech of the hostile, unappreciative social order; rather, all are able to babble freely in nonsense syllables without arousing any adverse comment. Through regression, the faithful are able to leave the hostile world far behind.

Another psychological mechanism which also operates at the unconscious level is *identification*. The individual who worships Daddy Grace may live in a mean tenement in the worst slum, but "Daddy"—his friend and savior—owns the largest apartment house in the world. The individual may have

nothing; perhaps he is pressed to pay his rent and to meet his grocery bill. Yet, through introjection, he becomes a part of Daddy Grace, so that now he, too, shares in a sense all that Daddy Grace owns. In other words, identification with Bishop Grace permits vicarious compensation for the ills and hardships of daily life. Moreover, by his acts of public worship in the House of Prayer, the humble individual has a further opportunity to compensate for the difficulties which life may have dealt him. Despite his lowly position in the external world, he can excel in the House of Prayer; he can testify and others will listen to him respectfully; he can wear the distinctive sash of high religious office; he can use the simple instruments of the orchestra without formal musical training.

Finally, the House of Prayer affords an opportunity for these people to vent their aggressive drives in a manner sanctioned by their friends and pastor. In every sanctuary there is a large illustrated placard bearing these words: "As the others go down, the House of Prayer goes up." Accompanying this message there is an idealized picture of the House of Prayer in a flamboyant architectural style comparable to a mighty Gothic cathedral. All about the building is a radiant halo of light. Beneath the cathedral is the rubble formed by the "churches of the world." Here is depicted the triumph of the true faith over the false. The members look up at this picture and all of their resentments can be channeled into approved feelings of hostility toward "other faiths." No doubt not all of these various factors motivate every individual, but perhaps they do suggest the satisfactions which the average member is able to find within the House of Prayer.

III. A GROUP WITH A MYTH—THE "BLACK JEWS"¹

There is a third kind of store-front religion which is strongly oriented toward a sacred myth. This myth is the focal point for all the activity of the group. To these people this myth is not a fiction, but something in which they passionately believe—just like all those basic assumptions on which we ourselves act without giving them conscious thought. Perhaps this may be made clearer by defining the myth as an organized mental picture of the world. As such, it comprises those preconceived images in terms of which the world is perceived. The myth, therefore, gives both meaning and understanding to life. It provides an underlying stability and order to

¹ The Church of God and Saints of Christ is to be distinguished from such groups as the Commandment Keepers, who are also called "Black Jews." The latter was founded by a Fallash or Ethiopian Jew who had an orthodox rabbinical training. This group has synagogues in Harlem, New York and in other American cities. See Elmer T. Clark, *The Small Sects in America*, New York: Abingdon Press, 1937, p. 163.

chaotic social phenomena by supplying a permanent frame of reference. For this reason, the myth makes for emotional solace in times of crisis. A myth may be either true or false in an absolute sense, but for our purposes it must be understood in terms of its function in the life of a people.

There is a Negro group which has a particularly dramatic myth—namely, black people are not Negroes. Rather, they are Jews! And on this belief, a whole way of life and a unified conception of the universe has been built. These people say that the so-called Negroes are, in reality, the descendants of the "lost" tribes of Israel. In the beginning, all the Jews were black-skinned, but as a result of interbreeding with Caucasians during the time of the Roman Empire, the Jews gradually began to lose the characteristic color of their skin. All this was revealed by a prophet, one William Crowdy, who had a call from God in the latter part of the nineteenth century to lead his people to the true religion. Today, those who hold his beliefs are not a large group. In two hundred or more churches scattered throughout the urban areas of the United States, there is a total membership of perhaps slightly over 35,000. Surely, this is one of the most distinctive and colorful of all store-front religions.

I became familiar with the *Church of God and Saints of Christ*, as it is called, several years ago when I attended one of their modest store-front sanctuaries. Later on, I became better acquainted by visiting the headquarters in Belleville, Virginia. Since they think of themselves as Jews (although they believe that Jesus was the Messiah!), much of their theology and ritual has a Hebrew flavor. One of their leaders said to me, "As we come to understand our true heritage better, our practices become more and more Hebrew all the time." Therefore, it isn't surprising that the men wear *yarmelkes* (skull caps) on their heads. At the time of the important religious holidays, the presiding bishop will wear the costume of an Old Testament High Priest. The Jewish calendar—with Hebrew names for the months—is used to determine the religious holidays. The Hebrew Sabbath is celebrated, beginning at sundown on Friday and terminating at sunset on Saturday. There is an annual observance of the Passover for a period of one week, which includes the slaying of the Paschal Lamb and the eating of unleavened bread with bitter herbs. This is a time of tremendous significance in the lives of these people—a period of great social as well as religious importance, when the membership comes to Belleville from far and near. Even the Hebrew custom of circumcision, which was not insisted upon originally, is now being performed increasingly on the younger males.

This faith presents a curious fusion of Old Testament Judaism and Christian theology; yet it goes beyond a mere blending of these culture complexes—for these “Black Jews” have created a faith and a liturgy all their own. This is evident from observing a tabernacle (as they call their place of worship), for both its ritual and its membership. Like the people who attend other store-front churches, these form a group from the lower economic strata, and their tabernacles reflect this poverty. Despite the lack of material pretension, the decoration of the church and the costumes of the congregation are really impressive. There is the pulpit all covered with brown and blue silks, and there is the great brass trumpet used to call the people to worship. Seated on the platform are the officials of the tabernacle, dressed in cutaway English walking-suits of brown, with stiff, white shirt-fronts and winged collars. According to rank within the group, all wear lapel rosettes of varying size and color with long streamers to match.

Just below these dignitaries and the Elder, sits the choir in a large half-moon formation. Many of its members are women—all of whom are dressed in brown skirts and elaborately tucked blue shirtwaists, with starched collars and bow ties. Brown and blue are the colors of the group: “brown is to remind man of his closeness to the earth, and blue to show that heaven is never far away.” On the heads of the women are crowns of red felt with embroidered gold stars to symbolize the celestial splendor of the heavenly realm. These costumes, worn for worship by both young and old, have the purpose of showing the similarity of all before the Almighty. They also have the effect of setting these people apart from the others of this world by suggesting the distinctiveness of their own spiritual life.

Many aspects of their ritual are striking. Perhaps the most impressive of all is their music. No musical instrument is ever used in the tabernacle. Stamping of the feet and clapping of the hands provide an intricate rhythmic accompaniment to their elaborately developed melodies. Frequently there is a gentle movement of their bodies to the music, “. . . like wheat swaying in the wind to honor the Creator . . . ,” as they say. It seems pleasantly contagious. The little children in front and the older members of the congregation who are not members of the choir also sway with the singers. This is far from the violent, orgiastic emotional demonstration found in most other store-front groups. Rather, it is a happy and joyous display of faith, somewhat sedate by comparison.

The choir master will begin one of their many religious selections in a deep, high bass voice. Each word is sung distinctly: “The . . .

Lord . . . Is . . . My . . . Shepherd . . ." Then antiphonally, several voices sing, in an ascending crescendo, the words, "I . . . shall . . . not . . . want . . ." With this introduction, the choir develops the entire Psalm in varying musical idioms for a period of fifteen or twenty minutes. In structure, some of the music is almost as if it were composed in a classical form utilizing both major and minor development. One movement may be *allegro moderato*, while another may be *adagio*, and yet a third may be *prestissimo*. Each movement may display embellishments of many characters such as particularly involved syncopations. Yet most of the singing of these people properly falls into the category of folk music. The melodies and arrangements are absorbed by rote, being passed on from one to the other without ever being written down.

If their songs have an emotionally moving character, it is equally true of the grand marches given each Sabbath. These are participated in by members of the choir who sing as they leave their places at the front of the room and march to the rear. Benches are pushed aside so that the marchers may demonstrate their skills. The formations are quite involved. First, they march in single file, then by twos and fours, and finally by eights. Around and around they move, their feet and their clapping hands keeping the tempo of the marching song. Some of the marching seems dolorous, some joyous. Their leader, carrying a long shepherd's crook, assumes the role of Christ leading the sheep. They turn toward the platform using a prancing step—" . . . like spirited horses . . ." When they approach the pulpit where the Elder of the tabernacle stands to welcome them, each in turn smiles radiantly, saluting the Bible held before them. All of this is a tremendously exhilarating experience to both the participants and the observers, even if the march is given in one of the smaller tabernacles. "It's entirely symbolic," I was told. "Marching to the rear of the room is to remind us of going to the grave and then returning to life as we honor the open Bible, the treasury and center of our faith. . . ."

With these people, more than with any other group with whom I am familiar, there is an elaborate ritual for giving. At one point during the Sabbath, all other activities cease and the men of the tabernacle bring portable tables into the auditorium and set them up at predesignated spots. When a signal is given from the platform, a number of the women seat themselves at these tables and the financial account books are placed before them. One of these women is Secretary for Tithes, a second is Secretary for Benevolences, and a third is Secretary for the Widows' and Orphans' Home; there are, perhaps, ten others to take care of the additional

tabernacle demands. The rest of the congregation arrange themselves in a single file and one by one they pass before each of the tables, dividing their offerings so that each secretary receives a portion. As a contribution is made, the name of the giver is read aloud. It is almost as if this ritual were designed to make the obligation of giving even more pleasant.

More than the transitory local groups or the charismatic people, the groups with a myth (as exemplified by the Black Jews) manifest a distinct way of life. It is their intimate and long association with one another—as well as their social idealism—which does so much to make them a cohesive unit. The institution of the Sabbath, for example, cannot help but develop a social stability. Instead of attending services for an hour as do many church-goers, these people are in continuous worship from sunrise to sunset. When exercises are not actually being held, as at lunch time, there is opportunity for friendly conversation which deepens the social bonds. In addition, the custom of going to Belleville for the celebration of the Passover leads to a greater feeling of unity with members from other tabernacles. Young people belonging to the church meet and many find marriage partners within the church. They do not find it difficult to carry out the injunction of the Bishop forbidding marriages with non-members. By so doing, each generation comes to think of the Church of God and Saints of Christ as *the* church and its ways as *the* way of all. It is for this reason that the Black Jews have been able to maintain a greater degree of stability than most store-front groups.

These people have a high degree of idealism which encourages a nobility of conduct. I asked one young couple if others from their tabernacle lived in the same community with them. Collectively, they answered, "No, but we are striving to live so that people around us will want our faith." There is much evidence of their attempt to live a life governed by this religious idealism. Prior to the Feast of the Passover, all are required to confess their shortcomings and to consecrate themselves anew to that which is holy and pure. Parents are charged with a responsibility for developing strength of character in their children. Once I commented to some parents on the excellent deportment of their children during the long hours of the Sabbath. "We think it's difficult," they replied, "for children to sit quietly during the services—but by learning to restrain themselves in church they acquire the discipline for living good lives."²

² The church goes even further. They have a program of social welfare for their own people which is in harmony with the traditions of ethical idealism. Widows and orphans from the group are the special object of their attention. Every tabernacle, however small, contributes to the fund which maintains their orphanage school and homes for those who are unable to take care of their private needs.

Never among store-front peoples have I seen a more happy and friendly group. Although the foundation of their faith is a myth which may appear difficult to sustain intellectually, there seems to be something about it which overcomes any such limitations. As is the case with the justification of many other faiths, super-rational sanctions are ultimately more important than those of logic. A man, long prominent in his faith, and with a background of two years in college, told me that he was going to give whatever powers of leadership he might have to the church because "it maintains an ideal for my people too precious to be lost." This may explain in part the motivation of many of the finest people in this group. But coupled with this idealism, there appear to be social and psychological motives which are at least equally important for many.

For the few, there is the joy of intellectual adventure within the church. "We have had a rabbi working with us to give us deeper insights into Jewish customs and thinking," they told me. "As time goes on, we keep delving deeper and deeper into our Hebrew background." The church takes these people vicariously from the sordidness of the present to the rich imagery of Oriental Judaism—deep into what they believe is their natural birthright. From what they believe to be their Jewish heritage, they obtain an emotional security. Since they feel they are the "chosen people," God has an important place for them, a mission for them to perform, and a way of life for them to follow—even if the world looks with false perspective upon them as Negroes.

The Church of God and Saints of Christ also has an institutional organization which does much to satisfy the desire for recognition. But even more satisfying to most is the friendly atmosphere seen everywhere when they worship together. I remember a faltering talk which was given before a tabernacle congregation by a very nervous young woman. So frightened was she that I doubted she could continue after the first few sentences. But she did go through with her assignment and finally ended on a note of triumph. Perhaps the greatest factor in her accomplishment was her responsive audience. From the beginning there were friendly nods and appreciative glances. Once, when she momentarily forgot a word and then recalled it after a few agonized minutes, the audience responded aloud, "That's all right—we just knowed you knew it. . . ." This spirit is one explanation for the existence of the Church of God and Saints of Christ. For many it is, without doubt, the most important.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the process of making this impressionistic analysis, a number of conclusions about store-front religions emerged. These groups are characterized by a definite ecological distribution which seems to limit them, almost without exception, to transitional urban areas. Bishop Grace may have a fine home in the better residential section of the city, but the local House of Prayer is located in the slums. Although in some of the better districts of the community there are simple auditoriums with an electric sign reading "Jesus Saves," these churches belong, almost without exception, to the more organized peoples such as the Assemblies of God, which has reached denominational status in many parts of the country. As such, they are not true store-front groups. This ecological distribution may be related to the fact that store-front religions appeal to those classes and castes of our population which are socially and economically insecure. There is reason to believe that when a member achieves advancement in status he no longer requires the kinds of satisfaction offered by store-front groups. Because of these factors, a large proportion of the membership in such groups is Negro—although in each of the groups described above, there is a sprinkling of Caucasians.

With the exception of the Black Jews, most of these groups tend to be schismatic. For example, a small group broke away from the House of Prayer and took the name, *House of Faith*. A similar body, also schismatic, is known as the *Latter House of the Lord for All People*. These schisms may be fostered by nebulous or even incoherent theologies. To attempt any systematic statement of their points of view is a task beset with many difficulties. Listening to sermons, talking with officials, and even reading the fragmentary materials which are very occasionally published by these groups disclose lack of coherence which is baffling to the serious inquirer. Even to say that they hold a position similar to Christian Fundamentalism would be far from easy to establish.

As these studies suggest, there is considerable variation in theological position among the groups. Moreover, they are not alike psychologically, socially, or even morally. They range from a psychopathic emotionalism (which seems to give the psychoneurotic and psychotic some place for haven) to groups, such as the Black Jews, which emphasize wholesome personality development. There are some with a high ethical or moral purpose, such as one group which attempts to provide the children of the slums with a simple social program designed to keep them from the questionable society

of the streets. On the other hand, my observations have led me to feel that there are some groups whose leaders and congregations subscribe to a questionable ethical code.

It seems reasonable to question the social values of the religion offered in many store-front groups. The extremes of behavior encountered in a number of such churches appear to be poor compensations for the difficulties the worshiper has found in life. At best, the broad answers to cosmic questions of destiny and mystery may be mere rationalizations to evade the stern realities of the social and economic world. To the degree that these religions are escapes from life rather than attempts to meet it realistically, they are not socially constructive. However, store-front churches exist, for better or for worse, largely because the great denominational bodies have failed to reach these people. If the large churches were satisfying them, they would feel it unnecessary to worship in such lowly places. It seems apparent, therefore, that such religious groups will continue until accepted religious or social institutions fill a void in the lives of the store-front people.

These religious groups are in general fragmentary and disorganized. To many observers it would appear doubtful that they are capable of making any lasting imprint on society either socially or theologically. However, before there is a categorical acceptance of this judgment it is well to recall that the social origins of the religious denominations and ecclesia of today were exceedingly humble. It seems likely that a contemporary might similarly have questioned their importance. Whatever position is assumed, it is evident that store-front religions must be further explored if we are to understand more fully their place in both the secular and the religious communities and their relationship to contemporary trends in American life.

The Minister's Use of Literature

M. C. ALLEN

I

THE CHAIRMAN of a pulpit committee is said to have insisted that for a candidate to be acceptable he must never have studied New Testament Greek nor ever have been to the Holy Land. Here was a chairman—more observant and sensitive than many—who had been given a stockpile of these pastoral wanderings and references sufficient to last a long time.

The minister who loves good literature will, like the one who has traveled in Palestine or spent days with his Greek Testament, want to be careful lest he succeed only in turning his congregation against that which he loves and has found most helpful. A certain woman's comment about her pastor comes to mind: "He's a very good man and his sermons are scholarly enough, but if he quotes from that man Carlyle once more I think I'll scream."

This pastor to whom she referred was a classicist of the old school and rare enough in our day to prove quite refreshing. What was deplorable, however, was not so much his frequent references to Carlyle as his refusal to get down to where the people were living and thinking. Literature was for him like the winged steed Pegasus. It bore him aloft, while the congregation, still rooted in the earth, gazed at his flight until they got tired of watching. Then they waited patiently for the descent, after which they went home more dazed than enlightened.

Here, one felt, was an exhibition glorious but pathetic, for the contribution of this eloquent preacher could have been stupendous had he but shown better judgment in the use of his reading. As it turned out, the desire to proclaim the gospel or to help people had been smothered by the greater yearning to be a *Prima Donna*. To make it worse, Carlyle and other great writers got the blame.

Let me mention another of these rare specimens of the pulpit. Contrary

MARION C. ALLEN, A.B., B.D., is Minister of the First Baptist Church, Lawrence, Kansas, and the writer of *Prayers for Worship* in *Pulpit Digest* from October 1948 to May 1958. The present paper was read before the Baptist Ministers' Discussion Group of Missouri.

to the first preacher, this minister was quite down to earth and something of a prophet too; but as a bibliophile of the first rank he had a way of littering the road he was traveling with bookish allusions.

Here is a typical sentence which this preacher employed to start his sermon: "The poet Browning has said, 'How hard it is to be a Christian.'" Truly Browning did begin a poem with these words, but anyone who has tried it knows how hard it is to be a Christian and has uttered the very words attributed to the poet. So why get Browning involved in all this? Would it not have been better to omit such a reference and save this great poet for a really significant verse? The argument, once again, should not be leveled against the authors but at the clumsy way in which they were dragged in. When one is driving along the highway he doesn't appreciate limbs in the road even though they be sturdy and bedecked with bright-colored leaves.

The adjective used to describe speakers who resort frequently to the classics or other literary sources is "polished." The rough circuit riders and the plain country preachers who first evangelized our land would hardly fit into this category. Polished men, however, like polished floors are likely to be slippery. There was nothing slippery about the proclamation of the backwoods preacher. He did not end his sermon with a flowery peroration or furbish up his conclusion with sentimental poetry. Those who listened, therefore, did not cry out, "Bravo! What a splendid performance!" Instead, they groaned, "He was certainly talking to me and my condition today. I've got to do something about this." It follows from this that if the literary allusion makes for admiration rather than commitment it is better to omit it altogether.

Contemporary theologians are reminding us in this connection that the Bible is unique in its power to bring man face to face with God. Containing some of the world's greatest literature, it seldom gives the impression of having been composed. The reader discovers more than an artistic intent. He is confronted by a message, an issue, a living Presence. Beautiful language, even the majestic loveliness of Elizabethan speech as found in the King James Version, may not be allowed to obscure that vital message to the average man. The Bible is more than literature. It packs a dynamic and imperative Word, and our major concern is that this Word be spoken to every man so that he cannot escape it or fail to comprehend.

Now the warning with which this article begins may be summarized. Here is the rule of thumb. Literature for the preacher may well be a source of pleasure and enjoyment, but he is justified in having recourse to it in

the pulpit only when it helps him get the message across. In a day when scientists are humble enough to admit that all technical advance provides no solution to the problem of human understanding and harmonious living, it is refreshing also to discover literary men who acknowledge that the ultimate solution lies in a realm beyond that of mere letters. Robert Louis Stevenson rightly declared, "Books are good enough in their own way, but they are a mighty bloodless substitute for life." The minister's concern is with life, life abundant, life eternal.

II

If some ministers quote Shakespeare too often from the pulpit, there are others who ignore altogether his incisive comments on our human frailties. This latter group compose a strong majority. Indeed, some preachers are prejudiced against any writing outside the Bible, and in this bias they are joined by countless laymen.

Let me illustrate. I had been badly pressed for time and Palm Sunday was threatening. No sermon was prepared, so I turned frantically to sermonic literature—not often the best type to draw from. The meditation borrowed in haste was a retelling of the incidents that led up to Palm Sunday, ending with the Triumphal Entry. There was little development of thought, almost no observations, just a rehashing of the Bible story. That afternoon I bumped into one of the pillars of the church. "Good sermon, preacher!" he shouted, "You didn't scatter your shot today."

He was never one to like buckshot scattered in his direction; so his conception of a sermon was definite. It should be line upon line, precept upon precept, verse after verse retold. Nor should this be done on a level above that of the Junior Department. Any reference to ethics, family problems, a living wage, literature, or life, was simply scattering one's shot. His wife agreed with him, and I was hardly surprised to hear her declare one day, "I don't read books" in the same tone one would use in saying, "I don't like spinach." Such members may constitute a majority of the congregation, but the minister who lets them dictate his sermon each Sunday is taking the easiest way out and the most ignoble.

As already stated, commitment to Christ and the gospel towers above all else for the evangelical minister, but such an aim cannot be separated from a second obligation: to portray Christ in his glory and the gospel in its fullness. A cheap picture of Christ and a poverty-stricken concept of the gospel are inexcusable sins for the minister who knows better. That is why art has been the handmaid of religion. Our worship has been immeasurably

enriched by the contributions of many gifted artists, and sensitive ministers have been eager to appropriate their offerings in the service of Christ.

With the scientist, the minister is trying to lay hold on that which is true and real, not only on that which is beautiful; but with the artist, the minister is dealing with life and must therefore throw himself into his experiment. The scientist in his laboratory is careful to be as objective as possible. In mathematics one can be highly objective, in physics, a little less so; in chemistry, biology, history, increasingly less. In religion one is not dealing with abstract truth alone. Like the artist, the one who would know Christian truth must give himself to his experiment.

Moralists have frequently had a quarrel with artists because artists have so often had little regard for morality. Literary as well as other artists have occupied themselves with the sensuous until they have themselves become sensual. That is, beginning with things pleasing to eye, ear, nose, touch, they have come to be enthralled by gratification of bodily appetites.

But as the writer repels through his sensualism, so the moralist repels through his puritanism. The one takes the role of the Prodigal Son, the other plays the part of the Elder Brother. The immorality of any writer, no matter how gifted, is not to be condoned or ignored; but the preacher, who frequently cannot see people as they are because of his passion for what they ought to be, may learn from the writer all the same. Enamored by far-away goals, we who preach do well to listen to the writer who has his ear to the ground, who reveals the emptiness of our age and its profound hunger.

In ancient Greece it was the dramatist rather than the philosopher who saw the radical nature of evil and the chain reaction of sin. It is not Aristotle but the tragedians, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, who tell us most about the ways of human flesh. Even the mighty Plato admitted near the end of his days that he had been too sanguine in his hopes for humanity, and it is related of Thales that as he walked along watching the stars one night he tumbled into a well. That can happen to the present-day clergyman too. The literary craftsman strives to preserve us from such a fate. Listen to Joseph Conrad as he sets forth his aim.

To arrest, for the space of a breath, the hands busy about the work of the earth, and compel men entranced by the sight of distant goals to glance for a moment at the surrounding vision of form and color, of sunshine and shadows; to make them pause for a look, for a sigh, for a smile—such is the aim, difficult and evanescent, and reserved only for a very few to achieve.¹

¹ Conrad, Joseph, *The Nigger of the Narcissus*, Doubleday, Page, & Co., 1914, Preface, xvi.

For the preacher, I am convinced, the paramount issue is not theology but communication. The jolts of two world wars and the spread of the neo-orthodox theology have rendered most of us sufficiently conservative. Rationalists among the clergy are so few that we run the risk of using dogmas as pillows for slumber. Frenzy and suspicion fill the air, and all of us are afraid of our new-found power. Because of this we may be quick to point the finger of criticism at all who dissent; but theologically we have been trying to find the middle of the road. What is needed in addition to patience is effectiveness in getting the message across. Neo-orthodoxy itself is hardly famous for its clarity.

Perhaps, then, the greatest help we can gain from literature is not to be found in sketches of drama, bits of poetry, or revealing anecdotes, but in a visit behind the stage to learn how the craftsman speaks to men and catches their attention. Joseph Conrad, who could speak no English at all as a young man and yet became one of the greatest masters of style, speaks to us again.

Fiction—if it at all aspires to be art—appeals to temperament . . . endows passing events with their true meaning, and creates the moral, the emotional atmosphere of the place and time. Such an appeal to be effective must be an impression conveyed through the senses; and, in fact it cannot be made in any other way . . . if its high desire is to reach the secret spring of responsive emotions . . . And it is only through complete, unswerving devotion to the perfect blending of form and substance; it is only through an unremitting never-discouraged care for the shape and ring of sentences that . . . the light of magic suggestiveness may be brought to play for an evanescent instant over the commonplace surface of words; of the old, old words, worn thin, defaced by ages of careless usage.

My task which I am trying to achieve is, by the power of the written word to make you hear, to make you feel—it is, before all, to make you *see*. That—and no more, and it is everything. If I succeed, you shall find there according to your deserts . . . and, perhaps, also that glimpse of truth for which you have forgotten to ask.²

Should we not, as ministers, welcome any help we might obtain from writers whose life's ambition is to make the reader hear, feel, and above all to see? Happy is the preacher who can arouse his people by the power of the spoken word to hear, feel, and see. Handle once more such smooth phrases as "love of God," "following Jesus," "human brotherhood," "giving our best," and consider whether the tools of our profession are not "old, old words, worn thin, defaced by ages of careless usage."

Whereas we may think with the philosopher and theologian, we do well to express ourselves with the literary craftsman. He will deliver us from

² *Ibid.*, p. xiii.

flowery speeches on the one hand and from pale abstractions on the other.

Many sermons are filled with vague generalizations; yet preachers wonder why the people begin to yawn before the indefinite essay is finished. How many of us have talked long and loud about "the ultimate values of life," or on "putting first things first, under the aspect of eternity." If you are guilty too, consider with me this little incident from the writing of a professor who is also an artist.

A student walked across the campus with a professor. It was graduation-time. "What are you going to do, John?"

"Well, I'm going to put up a shingle and start in at the law."

"And then?"

"Well, Professor, I have always thought I'd like to make a try in politics—the Legislature maybe."

"Fine. And then?"

"The Governor's chair, if I can land it. Maybe on to national office. I'll keep right in the ring all the time."

"Good, John. And then?"

"Well, Professor, of course I'll get old after a while. I suppose in time I'll have to slow up a bit; retire. Then I'll travel and do a lot of things I have always wanted to do."

"And then?"

"Professor, we fellows don't say much, but we think occasionally. The final act and slow music comes for all of us. I suppose I'll just have to do like everybody else and when the time comes, face the end of the road—and beyond."

"Yes, John. And then?"⁸

III

Although too frequent use of quotations may clutter the sermon, one should not hesitate to repeat from time to time what a master has said when the expression cannot be equaled by the preacher himself. Indeed, a sparkling epigram may sometimes serve as a good lead inviting further elaboration in the sermon.

For example, a minister is thinking of the tyranny of clock and calendar and of how Jesus who "with fewest hours finished God's divinest work," wresting victory from the inexorable hours. The preacher searches for a declaration of independence and chances upon this word of Thoreau: "Time is the stream I go a-fishing in." There is his lead—no use trying to improve on that. Or again, from the same author the minister discovers this word of encouragement for all who would "be not conformed to this world": "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he

⁸ Knopf, C. S., *The Student Faces Life*, Judson Press, 1932, pp. 221f.

hears a distant drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

If you are a short story fan, you may find that they help give flesh and blood to abstract truth. Recalling the parables of our Lord, you may realize that in using the short story to illustrate spiritual truth you are in the best of company. A story I found helpful in this manner is Guy de Maupassant's "A Bit of String." It proved more effective than a longer exhortation on the necessity of rising above gossip would have done. Here is the plot of de Maupassant's classic.

A thrifty French peasant, walking into the village of Goderville on market day, spied a piece of string, stooped down and picked it up. He was observed by an enemy with whom he had recently quarreled. Shortly thereafter it was announced that a wallet containing 500 francs and valuable papers had been lost. The rumor spread that the peasant had been seen picking up the wallet, and all his efforts to clear himself proved useless. Some days later the wallet was found, and the maligned peasant rejoiced to think that his reputation had been cleared. But no, it was then maintained that he had hired an accomplice to return the wallet. All this so affected the old man that he took to his bed and within a few weeks was gone.⁴

It is well to distinguish at this point between the mere anecdote and the literary illustration. Dr. James D. Morrison supplies us with a helpful comparison. Light may be provided, he observes, by any window, but a stained glass window is characterized by beauty, harmony, and reverence as well. "The anecdote may supply light; the literary illustration provides not only light, but also an atmosphere of harmony and beauty which enables the imagination the more readily to grasp the thought."⁵

It is worth taking the time in a sermon to build the dramatic setting for the literary illustration. Then the illustration will provide more than light; it will add its own power and clinch the point the preacher makes.

So often has it been pointed out that it need only be mentioned here that books of "canned illustrations" are usually worthless. This is especially true of the dramatic story. The preacher will want to remember that story in its literary context and watch it come and knock at the door of his developing thought. Then with ecstatic joy he will bid it enter. How different a scene from that of the minister who ransacks other men's sermons for stories that will seldom become his own!

⁴ Mention may here be made of Robert Luccock's book of helpful sermons based on short stories: *The Lost Gospel*, Harper & Brothers, 1948.

⁵ *The Christian Century Pulpit*, April, 1942, p. 93.

If one is well read in literature, the power of association will lead him to set up interesting and impressive parallels between the Scriptural scene and historical or literary events. Dr. George Adam Smith gives an example of such a parallel in his discourse on Hosea. The comparison is drawn between the attitude of Hosea toward faithless Gomer and that of King Arthur toward faithless Guinevere in Tennyson's *Idylls of the King*.

For Hosea himself his home could never be the same as it was at the first . . . Discipline was needed there; and abroad the nation's troubles called the prophet to an anguish and a toil which left no room for the sweet love or hope of his youth. He steps at once to his hard warfare for his people; and through the rest of his book we never hear him speak of home, or of children, or of wife. So Arthur passed from Guinevere to his last battle for his land:

"Lo! I forgive thee, as Eternal God
Forgives: do thou for thine own soul the rest.
But how to take last leave of all I loved?
* * * * *

I cannot touch thy lips, they are not mine; . . .
I cannot take thy hand; that too is flesh,
And in the flesh thou hast sinned; and mine own flesh,
Here looking down on thine polluted, cries
'I loathe thee'; yet not less, O Guinevere,
For I was ever virgin save for thee,
My love thro' flesh hath wrought into my life
So far, that my doom is, I love thee still.
Let no man dream but that I love thee still.
Perchance, and so thou purify thy soul,
And so thou lean on our fair father Christ,
Hereafter in that world where all are pure
We too may meet before high God, and thou
Wilt spring to me, and claim me thine, and know
I am thine husband, not a smaller soul. . . .

Leave me that,
I charge thee, my last hope. Now must I hence.
Thro' the thick night I hear the trumpet blow."⁶

Here are two more parallels that come to mind. (1) Omar Khayyam (Quatrain XXXVI) and Jeremiah both visited the potter's shop, but what they saw was quite different. (2) The author of the book of Jonah and Cervantes in Don Quixote are both poking fun at provincial and reactionary ideas. Perhaps some evils can best be laughed out of existence.

A justly famous parallel is to be found in "The Grand Inquisitor," an often reprinted chapter from Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*. Ivan contemplates a poem in which Jesus returns to Seville, Spain, in the

⁶ Smith, G. A., *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, Harper & Brothers, 1928, Vol. I, pp. 267f.

time of the Inquisition. He is recognized by the people and proceeds to heal them; but he is seen by the aged Inquisitor who has him thrown into a dungeon. In the evening this Cardinal comes to Jesus and rebukes him for laying waste what authority the church has been able to muster unto herself.

Reference is made in the Cardinal's speech to the temptations of Jesus in the wilderness, and here is where the parallel becomes manifest. "We have corrected Thy work and have founded it upon *miracle, mystery and authority.*" The tempter, says the Inquisitor again, was the wise one. He proposed that Jesus give men bread, and Jesus had refused, saying, "Of what worth is devotion bought at the price of bread?" But men would die for bread, for security, while Jesus offered only freedom. So, the Inquisitor contends, "We have corrected Thy work. . . . Thou shalt see that obedient flock who at a sign from me will hasten to heap up the hot cinders about the pile on which I shall burn Thee for coming to hinder us."

And what was the response of the Christ? "The old man longed for Him to say something, however bitter and terrible. But he suddenly approached the old man in silence and softly kissed him on his bloodless aged lips."⁷

The preacher who is not afraid of Shakespeare may rejoice in the analogy between the summons of Christ to the good fight today and the call of Henry V at the battle of Agincourt. Westmoreland, realizing that the English were heavily outnumbered, wished for more soldiers, but Henry rebuked him in memorable words.

No, faith, my coz, wish not a man from England.
 God's peace! I would not lose so great an honour
 As one man more, me thinks, would share from me
 For the best hope I have. I do not wish one more!
 Rather proclaim it, Westmoreland, through my host,
 That he which hath no stomach to this fight,
 Let him depart. His passport shall be made . . .
 This day is called the feast of Crispian.
 He that outlives this day, and comes safe home,
 Will stand a tip-toe when this day is named,
 And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
 He that shall live this day, and see old age,
 Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbors,
 And say, "Tomorrow is Saint Crispian."
 Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars,
 And say, "These wounds I had on Crispin's day." . . .
 But we in it shall be remembered,
 We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.
 For he to-day that sheds his blood with me

⁷ Dostoevsky, F., *The Brothers Karamozov*, Modern Library, pp. 303-323.

Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
This day shall gentle his condition;
And gentlemen in England now a-bed
Shall think themselves accurs'd they were not here.⁸

IV

Books, as Stevenson admitted, are a mighty bloodless substitute for life. This, however, in no degree warrants a life without recourse to good books. Experience is the stuff of life, but that stuff can get monotonous. It needs to be intensified, purified, interpreted. Scoffers who mock the work of the artist assume that art is but an imitation of life. But consider a portrait by Van Gogh. A photograph would give far better imitation of the scene painted. What we have is the scene as it appears through the prism of the artist's mind. What we have is interpretation, insight.

Are we not in constant need, as ministers, of aid in interpreting life, pointing up experience, piercing the meaningless round of existence? The good author provides this through the most easily understood medium, not music or painting but words. Let me call to the witness stand a contemporary philosopher of note, Professor Irwin Edman:

It might appear on the surface that the actualities of life, the impingements of those so very real crises of birth and death and love, are more intense than any form of art provides. That is true. But we do not live always amid crises, and the ordinary run of our experiences give us only emotions that are dull and thin. A tragedy like *Hamlet*, a novel like *Anna Karenina*, clarify and deepen for us emotional incidents of familiar human situations. For many people, it is literature rather than life that teaches them what their native emotions are. And ideas themselves, which in the abstractions of formal reasoning may be thin and cold and external, in the passionate presentation of poetry and drama may become intimate and alive.⁹

Reading the classics helps us understand past ages often better than the reading of history. The classics do more. Having survived the test of time, they point to eternal truths. We need such stability as they can provide for our fear-ridden, uncertain age.

Yet the minister who cannot discern the signs of our times and needs of the people is but a pretender as he goes through the motions of his calling. At this point contemporary literature is of greatest assistance. We may not like what the poet, the dramatist, the novelist, is saying, but we are stupid to ignore it. We can help little where we do not understand.

Special mention should be made of another contribution that great literature can make to the minister's discourse. I refer to elevation, a

⁸ Shakespeare, W., *Henry the Fifth*, Act IV, Scene III.

⁹ Edman, Irwin, *Arts and the Man*, Mentor Book, W. W. Norton & Co., 1950, pp. 25f.

feeling of the majestic, the awe-inspiring. Despite his negative response, the modern poet by the melody of his plaintive music does more to instill reverence than does the popular rhymester by his sentimental doggerel. The witness of Hardy in "The Darkling Thrush" and of Arnold in "East London," (where the one testifies of "some blessed hope" and the other of a minister who fared bravely in the midst of a squalid setting because he had been "much cheered with thoughts of Christ, the living bread") such witness is the more impressive because it issues from doubting minds.

Whether the writer is depicting great characters like Jean Valjean in *Les Misérables* or Father Chisholm in *The Keys of the Kingdom*, or tragic characters like Macbeth or Othello, he works into his portrait hues of nobility which the minister may use to give elevation to his own theme. The importance of such elevation cannot be stressed overmuch. Laymen may warm up to homey witticisms and jingles, but they will not be greatly helped by them; whereas, if the minister presents the gospel in its glorious majesty, he will at least have the assurance that he is true to himself and the Word. (James Weldon Johnson in his poem, "The Creation," pictures a Negro preacher consumed by the bigness of his theme, an example we might well follow.)

There is a place, of course, for the light touch in one's preaching, but if reverence is to be maintained the minister must have a sense of propriety. It is for him to realize whether his theme is great or small, whether it is time to laugh or to weep. From an uncomfortable experience, I solemnly affirm, however, that this sense of fitness can to some degree be learned.

Almost twenty years ago I was assigned a sermon to be delivered before a class in homiletics at Yale Divinity School. I was speaking on the Cross and had prepared what I thought was a clever sermon. The professor, a shrewd Yankee who had little use for sentimentality, listened with growing contempt and would doubtless have walked out but for the opportunity that was soon to be his.

I was frivolous when I came to deal with the sense of futility that prevails in our day. Here is a jingle I used to illustrate the prevailing impression among the common folk:

The baby hasn't any hair.
The old man's head is just as bare.
Between the cradle and the grave,
Lie but a haircut and a shave.

Where I was not frivolous I was gushy; and both expressions were ferociously attacked by the professor. "Get away from your cheap illustrations,"

he shouted, "when you're talking about the Cross." Then he went on to affirm that here if ever in one's preaching the stark tragedy of life should be laid bare, and the loftiest and noblest literature used in depicting the cosmic greatness of the Cross. For an example in tragedy he suggested Hardy's *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*, that story of the innocent girl who was first made the victim of one man's vice and then was forsaken because of another man's conventional virtue. Only after her revenge on the first offender had issued in her own death was "the President of the Immortals" finished with his sorry jest.

The professor seemed unduly severe that day and it took some time to get over the bruises, but I've always remembered what he said. Especially grateful I am for it too, for the religious tradition of our evangelistic churches has been weak where reverence and a sense of propriety are indicated. Unless the minister brings these virtues with him, he is not likely to be encouraged to acquire them.

In closing, this familiar word should perhaps be repeated. An affected interest in literature on the part of a minister is worse than useless; it is harmful. A genuine interest in literature, classic and contemporary, can be cultivated, however, and it has its rewards. It can broaden our own interests, increase our knowledge of our times, bring us to "worship greatness passing by." It will be fun. From this reservoir thus obtained within our own lives, water will flow to lips parched by the unassimilated, misinterpreted experiences of life.

The Called and the Chosen

A Comparative Study of Edith Stein and Simone Weil

NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE

TRUe ANCHOresses ARE CALLED BIRDS because they leave the earth, that is, the love of all worldly things, and, because of the longing of their hearts, they fly upwards towards heaven. . . ." How well that text matches the works of Simone Weil, just as another from the same twelfth-century *Ancrene Riwle* matches the life of Edith Stein: "True anchoresses spread their wings as the bird does when it is in flight, that is, in the intention of their heart and in the sufferings of their body, they carry God's cross. . . ."

Edith Stein was born toward the end of the nineteenth century, eighteen years before Simone Weil. During their lifetimes they never met, nor did they ever come across each other's writings; one was an enclosed nun, the other a kind of social prophet and religious mystic; both were of Jewish birth. Indeed, the fact that they have now come to be regarded as spiritual heroes of the twentieth century is an ironic after-effect of the second World War. For in 1942 Sister Benedicta of the Cross died in one of the gas chambers in Auschwitz, while a year later there was admitted to a Kent sanitarium a dreadfully haggard young woman of thirty-four; she gave no trouble to the staff, except by her steady refusal to eat the food which might have brought about her recovery, and the last cryptic entry in her journal is the single word, "Nurses."

Today countless people in Germany are offering prayers that this brave Carmelite from Breslau may be raised to the altars of the Church; in France many people believe that a modern Antigone has passed from their midst—a kind of uncanonized saint whose mission it was to knock at the door of the Church, but not enter. But neither story has yet ended. Simone Weil's works continue to exert a wider and wider influence the more they are translated, while the life of Edith Stein has inspired numerous believers to claim that they have received special favors through her inter-

NEVILLE BRAYBROOKE, an English Roman Catholic writer, is author of historical works on London and editor of *T. S. Eliot: A Symposium for His Seventieth Birthday* (Farrar, Straus and Cudahy). This article is from his forthcoming book of comparative studies, *The Hound and the Whale and Other Essays*.

cession and, in one case, a Dutchman from Nymwegen has also claimed that where doctors failed she wrought a miraculous cure. I draw this distinction between the *works* of one and the *life* of the other, because I think that it is this paradoxical distinction which really unites them as spiritual heroes. For whereas paradox was the strength behind the writings of one, it was the motivating power behind the vocation of the other.

In 1891, on October 12, the annual Jewish Day of Atonement, a seventh child was born to Auguste and Siegfried Stein; by the age of thirteen she had abandoned her belief in the faith of her fathers, and by twenty-one she was a self-confessed atheist. Eighteen years later in 1909 on February 3, when Paris so pictorially invokes the patronage of St. Blaise against sore throats, a second child was born to the Weil household in the Boulevard de Strasbourg (now the Rue de Metz); the parents were free-thinkers, and by the time their only daughter was old enough to become a student in her late teens at the Ecole Normale Supérieure she was already a determined agnostic with an antireligious bias. Her outlook remained extremely skeptical until during a brief holiday in Assisi in 1937 she was suddenly forced to her knees by an overpowering sense of devotion which swept over her in the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli. Force is the right verb because by nature she always tended to be stubborn; her early refusals to pray dated back to her early refusals to eat when at the precocious age of five she had astounded those about her by giving up sugar because of the hardships being endured by her countrymen in the trenches. When therefore in December, 1940, she subtitled an essay on *The Iliad* "A Poem of Force," she was merely developing a thesis which all her experience in life could back up. It was natural that she should find in the scene where a Trojan boy is reluctant to be dismissed to Hades a similarity to Christ's words to St. Peter: "Another shall gird thee and carry thee whither thou wouldest not."

She never invited divine intervention or religious experience; if they came they were the results of waiting, "waiting for God." Her attitude of self-renunciation she explains in her "reading" of the Lord's Prayer: "It is as when one is in extreme thirst, ill with thirst; then one no longer thinks of the act of drinking in a general way. One merely thinks of water, actual water itself, but the image of water is like a cry from our whole being."¹ Shortly after the visit to Assisi, the habit of saying this prayer daily forced itself upon her—a habit whose practice each time brought an experience "as if Christ took possession of me."

¹ Weil, Simone, *Waiting for God*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1951, p. 218.

Part of the linguistics course in German universities includes a study of the "Our Father" in the Gothic translation. Thus it was that in another sense Edith Stein was forced to "read" it as a student; later, when the role was reversed and she had students under her, she would tell them as they went through the text with her how much her first discovery of it had meant. Likewise, she too let the words speak in the hope that their radiance might shine through her—a process which gradually became for her as a contemplative one of more and more self-renunciation, a hint of which can be caught when as a lecturer she once commented, "A translator must be like a window pane which lets through all the light but remains itself invisible."

Simone Weil thought of herself similarly and yet differently. "One should think of oneself as the careful and meticulous translator, and not the originator of the ideas to be expressed." As a Jew, atheist, convert and nun each stage was part of a logical process for Sister Benedicta; life is lived forwards but understood backwards, and in her cell alone she could trace the pattern and, by recalling her own stages of development, speculate on those of others. "I may long for religious faith and yet it need not be given to me." Here she is stating part of her own case in retrospect—a case that at one time might have as easily applied to Simone Weil. On another occasion she writes: "Supposing a convinced atheist realizes the existence of God in a religious experience. He cannot indeed escape belief, but he does not enter its sphere; he does not make it effective in himself, but clings to his 'scientific Weltanschauung,' which would have been overturned by unqualified belief."² Again, this would have been true of any stage of Simone Weil's life before she entered the church of Santa Maria degli Angeli in Assisi: however, after that incident in 1937, she felt herself henceforth forced to try and become a sort of Christian outsider. Skeptical she might be by nature, but she had never been bound by any form of "scientific Weltanschauung"; instead she preferred to follow her own policy of waiting, working as best she could, setting down whatever came to her. "Ideas come and settle in my mind by mistake, then, realizing their mistake, they absolutely insist on coming out. I do not know where from nor what they are worth. But, whatever the risk, I do not think that I have the right to prevent the operation."³

These ideas leapt on the wings of paradox, and paradox was her faith

² Graef, Hilda C., *The Scholar and the Cross: The Life and Work of Edith Stein*. Longmans, Green and Co., 1955, p. 27f.

³ Weil, Simone, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

—a God who was both One and three, or a Creator whose Son was both God and man; a world of gravity in which the host offered by the priest could be “both earthly matter and the body of Christ,” or a pattern in history by which grace could allow “extreme justice” to be combined “with the appearance of extreme injustice.” Contradiction, as she maintained, was man’s wretchedness; and this feeling of wretchedness was also his feeling of reality. Contradiction was his path to God because he was a creature and creation itself was a contradiction. Contradiction, when it was experienced right to the very depths of man’s being, meant laceration and the Cross.

That last line of thought foreshadowed Edith Stein’s last hours in Auschwitz; if she did not know the manner of her death until the end, at least as far back as 1933 she had a premonition of its violence when she had prayed that “His Cross which was being laid on the Jewish people” (by Hitler) might in part be borne by her. Accordingly it was not surprising that when she came to be clothed the next year she should choose for her name in religion, Sister Teresa Benedicta of the Cross. As a scholar and lecturer, this “Fräulein Doktor” had cut something of an austere figure; on those that could not keep up with her intellectual arguments, or with her powers of endurance when kneeling, she was apt to let fall her remote blue eyes in judgment. Sometimes friends used to think of her as spinsterly, lacking in humor and often absurdly overearnest, until in Carmel all this was changed.

A strict observance of the Rule taught her to be more tolerant with those weaker than herself, while the daily sweeping out of her cell and learning to sew and embroider were pastimes that helped to develop the feminine side of her character; she who had been so accustomed to speaking publicly on subjects such as “Woman’s Role in Home Life” had now put into practice in her newly adopted home what she had so often taught from the platform. For convents have a way of forcing their sisters down to earth before allowing them to scale the heights of contemplation. Likewise, in enclosed Orders, the excitement that surrounds a clothing is similar to the excitement that outside surrounds a white wedding. There is the bridal dress with its train to be made, just as there is the habit to be cut out; and in a charming book of memories Mother Renata describes how their new “sister” would be hurried from one workroom to another for fittings. True to tradition, this Carmel in Cologne was not without its cutters or *couturiers*—a delightful contradiction, or paradox, that cannot have failed to strike its new member!

“Her person is more important than her work.” Such was the verdict

of the Belgian paper, *De Linie*, five years after her death. For it was in her person that she came to grips with the problem of her Jewish inheritance and conversion to the Christian faith, resolving the contraries by which the God of Israel is the God of Genesis and hence the Father of all mankind whose only begotten Son came to fulfill, not abolish the old Law. The God of Wrath in the Old Testament became for her the God of Love in the New—a link between Moses and Christ that was further emphasized for her by Pope Pius XI when, in protest against the doctrine of Aryan discrimination, he proclaimed in 1933 that “spiritually we are all Semites.”

By a curious quirk in her makeup Simone Weil could never come to regard Judaism, or the Vatican, as anything but the enemies of Christ; nor can it be said in her defense that she was unaware of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* or of the slogan *Jude verrecke*; proof lay all around her—in the Paris bookshops and in the steady stream of exiles across France. In fact, this trait in her thinking, especially with regard to her own violent anti-Semitism, is often glossed over—although to refuse to face it is to misunderstand what it was that finally made her adopt the role of an outsider whose aim was to be a witness, but not a participant, of orthodoxy. The Old Testament inspired her with horror. “Moses—starts off with a murder—Joshua—then a host of ‘Judges’ (murders, betrayals)—Samuel—Saul—David—Solomon—Kings of Judah and Israel . . . Practically the only thing the Hebrews did was to exterminate.”⁴

When it came to contemporary affairs, she saw everything as subject to the force of gravity and gravity in turn brought everything down to earth, to a level of pain, disgust and despair. There was but one escape—upwards, an escape that could solely be achieved by waiting for God. To paraphrase one of the main arguments of *Waiting for God* and *Gravity and Grace*, it might be said that it was her belief that the contemplation of misery inevitably led to the contemplation of escape from misery—namely, to reflection on the supernatural; and so it was, she concluded, a man ought to love the source of his miseries, because “relentless necessity . . . distress, the crushing burden of poverty and of exhausting labour, cruelty, torture, violent death, constraint, terror, disease—all these were but divine love.” Out of love God had withdrawn so that man could love him.

In other centuries this would have been called Gnosticism. Indeed, in her own life from her first refusal to eat sugar as a child of five to her last refusal in the sanitarium to eat more than the diet being shared by those in Occupied France, there was apparent in her a strong Manichean

⁴ *The Notebooks of Simone Weil*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1956. Vol. II, p. 568.

streak as a result of which she could mistake self-laceration for "acceptance of the Cross." Her disappointment in the Jews and the Church lay in the fact that both were touched by mortality; the flaws which she could forgive in the followers of other religions—such as the Chaldeans and the Egyptians—she could not forgive in the case of Christians or Israel. She was a perfectionist who wanted either complete perfection or complete misery—terms which she was apt to translate as "All or Nothing," thinking primarily of the *Upanishads* or *Bhagavad Gita*, while tending to forget that *Todo y Nada* (All and Nothing) was the very similar maxim by which St. John of the Cross and St. Teresa of Avila had lived.

When Sister Benedicta tried to follow these mystics of her Order it was her aim to let their teaching shine through her, to be a window, one of many, in the long aisle that stretches back through the history of Carmelite spirituality. Yet to this company Simone Weil found herself a stranger, standing alone; behind her lay the fruit trees of Normandy and Kent, or above shone the stars over Paris and London—signs alike of fragility and permanence by which she came to learn the meaning of eternity. Perhaps her vocation was to be an outsider, or as Max Picard has suggested, perhaps "she did not receive baptism because God wanted to extend the bounds of Christianity to unbelievers, *in partibus infidelium*," since by taking possession of her, Christ took possession of all other non-Christians. In contrast, on the lecturer's rostrum as in the convent choir, Edith Stein had liked to ponder the fragility of human nature but the permanence of truth, remembering that fruit-picking season in Bergzaben in the Palatinate where the rhythm of the day had divided itself between the orchards and the library. Then early one dawn, "This is the Truth," she said to herself as she closed St. Teresa's autobiography for the first time. . . .

"True anchoresses are called birds. . . ." In their lives they carry God's cross, just as in their works their minds fly upwards toward heaven. Here lies the true balance between contemplation and action. But they are also called "anchors" by the author of *Ancrene Wisse*—and again how well that description matches the life of Edith Stein and the works of Simone Weil.

The Paralysis of "Inability"

A. APPLETON PACKARD

THE OLDER CALVINISM had no real place for any man's ability to do good. This was the paralyzing influence upon New England theology and theologians from the days of Colonial settlement. The early plan of requiring from candidates for church membership a long, detailed account of experiences of grace was doubtless appropriate when the first little companies had gathered together under the stress of persecution in England, when all their spiritual activities must of necessity have been marked. But this requirement could only serve as an unfortunate and embarrassing condition among the people of a later generation, born and brought up in the greater freedom of the New World, and without the thrilling experiences of their forefathers to give point to their views and depth to their lives.

However, with all the rest of the troubles nearly overwhelming them—Indian wars, governmental administration, local problems—there was a theological root at the base. This was the doctrine of "inability," the disastrous application of which we shall see. As the dogma of the sovereignty of God is one which affects the church differently at different times, so with Calvinism's congregational expression in northeast America it took the form of this conviction of man's inadequacy and helplessness in spiritual striving. Ultimately the doctrine broke down the theory of "new birth" or regeneration of the righteous in its relation to the church, as it discouraged early the actual exercise of repentance. From the standpoint of Catholic Christianity, the vital influence of such a pervasive teaching in restraining the Puritanically-inclined from that confession which is good for the soul, as has been proved time and again, is not without considerable significance for us today.

This may be illustrated well by a short excerpt from one of the earliest New England histories, written with such a theological background and unconscious purpose. In 1636, with the arrival of Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams, antinomian difficulties were at their height. Captain Ed-

A. APPLETON PACKARD, O.H.C., is a priest of the Order of the Holy Cross (in the Episcopal Church), Mount Calvary, Santa Barbara, California. He offers "an historical footnote to a phase of the earlier Calvinism which has now happily passed away. . . ."

ward Johnson, in his *Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Saviour*, cries, out:

Oh cunning Devill, the Lord Christ rebuke thee, that under pretence of a free and ample Gospell shuts out the Soule from partaking with the Divine Nature of Christ, in that mysticall Union of his Blessed Spirit, creating and continuing his Graces in the Soule; my dear Christ, it was thy worke that moved me hither to come [from England to America], hoping to finde thy powerfull presence in the Preaching of the Worde, although administered by sorry men, subject to like infirmitiess with others of God's people, and also by the glasse of the Law to have my sinfull corrupt nature discovered daily more and more, and my utter inability of any thing that is good, magnifying hereby the free grace of Christ; who of his good will and pleasure worketh in us to will, and to doe, working all our works in us, and for us.¹

That this was not an isolated outburst of unaccustomed fervor may be seen in a copy of a typical church covenant of the same year, 1636. The particular one referred to was transcribed by John Fiske from the original in the Collections of the Essex Institute of Salem, Massachusetts.² Article 2 states: "We give up our selves to ye Lord Jesus Christ, & ye word of his grace for ye teaching, ruling & sanctifying of us in matters of worship & conversation, resolving to cleave to him alone for life & glory, & to oppose all Contrary wayes, canons & institutions of men in his worship."³ Saint Paul's declaration, "Without Him we can do nothing," was certainly carried to an extreme both in theory and practice.

Yet by the end of the seventeenth century the religious decline throughout Massachusetts and beyond was causing serious heart-searching among pastors and interested laity. Doctrinally considered, the cause of it all—without forcing the evidence in the slightest—may be traced to this same doctrine of "inability," preached so as to deplete the churches by discouraging actual repentance and vital faith. Even Increase Mather in his *Order of the Gospel* of 1700 had to admit, "that there is a great decay of the Power of Religion throughout all New England is Lamentably true."⁴

With the theological acumen and fervent exposition of religious verities typified by Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758), however, the conflict of ideas—orthodoxy as opposed to incipient liberalism—began to make itself known to a wider circle, and to prepare the way for a change even in such a fundamental doctrine as "inability." He dared to reject the doctrine of God's

¹ Foster, F. H., *A Genetic History of the New England Theology*, Chicago, 1907, p. 135.

² Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 37-38.

³ Mode, P. G., *Source Book and Bibliographical Guide for American Church History*, Menasha, Wisconsin, 1920, p. 68.

⁴ Mollen, Charles, *The Conflict of Ideas in Colonial New England*, Paris, 1929 (p. 11 in Mather).

imputation of sin to man, and enunciated the great principle that ability and obligation are commensurate. Negatively, nowhere do we find in his works the refutation of such a sound principle.

At the time of his earlier labors, around 1730, Edwards did not yet see in this doctrine of "inability" the source of that ingrained conservatism and spiritual paralysis against which he so strenuously rebelled. Later, the light began to dawn, and by 1754 when he put forth his *Treatise on the Freedom of the Will*, he says: "Moral inability . . . consists in the want of inclination [to do good]; or the strength of a contrary inclination [meaning here, probably, an affection of the sensibilities]; or the want of sufficient motives in view, to induce and excite the act of the will, or the strength of apparent motives to the contrary."⁵ In other words, he attempted to extricate himself from the inevitable dilemma of such an unsound position by propounding a distinction which was not correct or successful as he presented it, but which proved, with a better understanding, of great use to his successors. This was the difference between "natural" and "moral" ability and inability—"can't" and "won't" do good. Here two paths were set before New England's theologians. After a century the path of ability was to become a well-trodden highway.

Even the title of Edwards' epoch-making work in this field (1754) shows its tendency to a "new freedom": *An Inquiry into the Modern prevailing notions / respecting that / Freedom of Will, which is / supposed to be essential to Moral Agency, virtue and vice, reward and punishment, praise and blame*. The following passage is taken from the edition of James Duncan, London, 1831:

It becomes manifest, that God's moral government over mankind, his treating them as moral agents, making them the objects of his commands, counsels, calls, warnings, expostulations, promises, threatenings, rewards, and punishments, is not inconsistent with a determining disposal of all events, of every kind, throughout the universe, in his providence; either by positive efficiency or permission.⁶

There is inability of a certain kind in this, but both literally and metaphorically he covers it with a torrent of words!

Reverberations were more frequently heard from that time on. Jonathan Mayhew (1720-1766) of Boston entered a protest against some applications of this doctrine of "inability" inherent in historic Calvinism, and over which other New England theologians were about to make equal protest.

⁵ Foster, F. H., *op. cit.*, p. 73 (p. 35 in Edwards).

⁶ Mollon, C., *op. cit.*, p. 51; Duncan's Conclusion, pp. 414-423.

Charles Chauncey (1705-1787), also of Boston, began his direct attacks against Jonathan Edwards' revivalism and newer thought in 1742, showing that there is no theological advance without accompanying protestation from some source, often of high esteem in contemporary eyes. From his *Seasonable Thoughts on the State of Religion in New England* (Boston, 1743), we gather that:

men may, 'tis true, place good Works in the Room of Christ, or of divine graces; & so they may under pretence of exalting Christ, and Grace, entertain the notion as tho' good Works were needless. . . . And the grace of God is so far from encouraging a Neglect of Good Works, that it is one of the strongest Excitements to the Performance of them. . . . And let not any imagine, that Christ, by obeying the Law in our Stead, has made void the Obligations we are under to conform to it in our own Persons, as a Rule of Life.⁷

Although violently attacking Edwardean "New light" enthusiasm and the methods of Whitefield, these quotations show a decided, albeit unintentioned, drift away from any idea of man's utter *inability* to do good.

In another book, *The Mystery hid from Ages and Generations, / made manifest by the Gospel-Revelation: / or The Salvation of All Men, by one who wishes / well to the whole Human Race* (second edition, London: printed for Charles Dilly, in the Poultry, 1787),⁸ we may extract these sentiments from the distinguished author:

The whole human race are considered, in the following work, as made for happiness; and it finally fixes them in the everlasting enjoyment of it, notwithstanding the lapse of the one man Adam, and all the Sin and Misery that ever has been, or will be, consequent hereupon.

[Also] As the First cause of all things is infinitely benevolent, 'tis not easy to conceive, that he should bring mankind into existence, unless he intended to make them finally happy. And if this was his intention, it cannot well be supposed, as he is infinitely intelligent and wise, that he should be unable to project, or carry into execution, a scheme that would be effectual to secure, sooner or later, the certain accomplishment of it.⁹

"Happiness" and "benevolence" so emphasized could not have sounded very sweet to Calvinistic ears attuned to "inability."

The oldest and most eminent of Edwards' disciples and successors, Bellamy and Hopkins, were born respectively in 1719 and 1721, and entered in the flush of their earliest manhood into the work of the "Great Awakening" of religious enthusiasm which swept the Northern colonies of America like wildfire in the forties and fifties of the eighteenth century.¹⁰ To Hopkins

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 55; Chauncey, *op. cit.*, p. 284, p. 283.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 56; Chauncey's Preface, p. v.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 57; Chauncey's Introduction, p. 1.

¹⁰ Bacon, L. W., *A History of American Christianity*, New York, 1897.

was granted the privilege of blazing the theological trail away from constraining "inability" to the broader air of "ability" to do good.

Joseph Bellamy, when it came to ability, simply followed in the path suggested by his mentor regarding the will. That paradox of Bellamy's rhetoric, "the more unable to love God we are, the more we are to blame," became characteristic of his school of thought.

In considering Samuel Hopkins' system of theology, we see first that it followed the revival preaching of both Edwards and Bellamy, and came after the latter had emphasized so strongly the ability of man to repent. If there could have been any question whether the paralyzing doctrine of inability, which had brought about ecclesiastical disaster to early New England, was to be repudiated and replaced by a doctrine of ability, paving the way for aggressive preaching and the winning of souls, it was now settled favorably to progress by Hopkins' clear adhesion to "ability."¹¹

He taught that man after the Fall is in a state of probation—that is, under a moral government—with the alternatives of life and death set before him, and endowed with full ability to choose the one or the other. Even so, he could not understand what Edwards had meant by natural inability—defined by him as "inability because of some impeding defect or obstacle that is extrinsic to the Will"—because he could not get at the precise meaning of "Will" in such a connection. Also, as a result of (perhaps impatience with) Edwardean subtle distinctions, in his discussion of "inability" a more fundamental question was touched upon. Hopkins pushed hard one of his principal theological opponents, Hemmenway, when he urged the query how a natural inability could be maintained which did not excuse the sinner.¹² The sinner in this case would, it seemed, have escaped any genuine Godward responsibility. Absurdity could become no more absurd.

Thus Hopkins won the fight for "ability." But the hardly contested position had to be consolidated, and for the next half century, particularly in country districts where sterner Calvinism died slowly, echoes of "inability" were still heard.

Looking back several decades, a typical country parson, the Rev. Increase Graves of Bridport, Vermont, about 1846 writes:

In our religious meetings, the doctrines insisted upon were the sovereignty of God, his purposes, total moral depravity, moral agency or accountableness, the circumstances which render human actions virtuous or vicious in the sight of God,

¹¹ Foster, F. H., *op. cit.*, p. 177.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 160.

justification solely by faith in Christ, the nature of saving faith and genuine repentance, the character of evangelical obedience, the obligations of men to do all they are able, just as much as if they could save themselves by their own works; the sure destruction of those who neglect to exert themselves in the right manner.¹³

Even here the leaven had penetrated.

Toward the close of the 1700's a later writer, Samuel West, was led to consider the natural and moral necessity and ability taught by Edwards, which, in agreement with Mr. Dana, he finds to be one and the same thing. And Nathaniel Emmons (1790-1859) still held to the position that "nothing in man is pleasing to God but instant submission, instant exercise of disinterested and universal benevolence."¹⁴

In scholarly circles we see men like N. W. Taylor of Yale in the 1810's who were declaring that "The natural ability is the true power; the moral ability, the condition of the will,"¹⁵ thus clinging to Edwards' definitions. He explained further, "Man's mind doubtless has power to will, but has not power in willing to avoid willing against its will, any more than a part has [to be] less than the whole, or than two and two not be four."¹⁶ By the next decade, Lyman Beecher of Boston held that "The Confession of Faith [Westminster] teaches plainly and unanswerably the free agency and natural ability of man as capable of choice, with the power of contrary election."¹⁷

Finally, in the 1840's, the great Dr. Park of Andover, Massachusetts, one of the outstanding Protestant theologians of New England, gave a new meaning and above all a new force to the idea of man's natural ability to choose the good. This he would have made a real freedom but for the shackles laid upon him by that maxim which he thought he had evacuated of its mischief—"inability"—but which, like a tamed cobra, possessed apparently both the power and the will to poison the theory, if not the practical application, of any theology cherishing it. "A man," he said, "has natural ability to repent, always, everywhere, without the influence of the Holy Spirit, without church or Bible; but he NEVER will so repent."¹⁸

The battle of "ability," however, had been won; Unitarianism had broken out from fostering Congregationalism, and Catholicism—Anglican and Roman—was at the beginning of new influence and pervasiveness

¹³ Walker, G. L., *Some Aspects of the Religious Life of New England*, Boston, 1897, p. 138.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 132.

¹⁵ Foster, F. H., *op. cit.*, p. 249.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 395.

¹⁷ Beecher, L., *Views*, pp. 35-48, 101; Foster, *op. cit.*, p. 433.

¹⁸ Cf. Foster, F. H., concluding chapter.

through the New England States. Strict Calvinism was from now on "unable" to dominate the religious horizon, because its confining theology had for too long prevented spiritual activity. Within a half-century Phillips Brooks' superb preaching illustrated man's *ability* to serve a God of love, the principal activity of the Christian soul.

Should the Churches Publish Secular Journals?

ROLAND E. WOLSELEY

ONE MIGHT EXPECT that religious journalism would share mightily in the popularity of religion in America today. Superficially it appears to have done so. We are told of the growing circulations of certain periodicals, such as *Presbyterian Life*, *Catholic Digest*, *The Upper Room*, *Together*, and *The Lutheran*.

Actually the religious press is losing ground rather than gaining it. Not only have some publications disappeared completely (*Episcopal Church-news*, *The United Presbyterian*, *Lifetime Living*, *Faith Today*, and certain other smaller ones) but also the religious journals by no means have returned to the place of major importance they occupied a century or more ago as influential organs of opinion.

Church publications have changed since that time and largely for the better. The changes may explain the ability of the religious press to hang on as long as it has. These publications are like the man who complained when he took pills but still was not well. His wife opined that if he had not taken the pills he might be even sicker. Editors who have enlarged staffs, added more art work, improved paper quality, used color printing and induced churches to subscribe for their members en masse still yearn for more circulation and advertising. But they might be even worse off had they not improved their publications as much as they have.

Nor have all the changes been physical. In general one can say that the religious press in America is much less conventional and conservative than it was, although the orthodox churches still bring out periodicals that reflect their theology. Some of these, incidentally, are among the best prepared from the standpoint of journalistic production. The old charge, that the press is chiefly a collection of house organs for denominations, is

ROLAND E. WOLSELEY, M.S., Litt.D., is Professor in the School of Journalism of Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York; his unique religious journalism program there is now ten years old. For five years he has served on the staff of the Christian Writers' and Editors' Conference at Green Lake, Wisconsin, sponsored by the National Council and the American Baptist Convention.

still largely true, and surprisingly so with some of the most splendid-looking of the publications, *Home Life* and *Together*, for example.

The interdenominational and nondenominational press has undergone some changes, also. But physically its members have not altered so strikingly as have many of the denominational publications. The important alteration affecting this group of general religious journals is a change in the public's reaction to them. A century or more ago there were numerous significant general journals which were taken as seriously as any of the popular publications of the day. They were known to the man on the street—as much as any newspaper or magazine was known to the man on the street—because certain ones were sold along with secular publications and competed with them.

Today, to be sure, we have *The Christian Herald*, *The Commonweal*, *The Christian Century*, *National Outlook*, *Christian Life*, *Jubilee*, *Christianity Today*, and a few others that cut across or are outside denominations. But these are rarely known to the general public. Unlike their predecessors of the Nineteenth Century, they get little attention in secular, political, or business circles. Their power is mainly within the religious world itself. They do, of course, have indirect influence on the secular world.

Numerous publications of the latter half of the preceding century, published either by religious bodies or individuals, demanded and obtained secular attention. Typical of the best of these was *Christian Union*, better remembered now as *The Outlook*. Other titles may be equally familiar: *The Independent*, *New York Observer*, *Christian Watchman*, and *The Methodist Magazine*. Then, as is less true now, religious periodicals were likely to be personal organs. Association with a "name" editor was a characteristic of all journalism then. It was common to hear talk of "Greeley's Tribune" or of what "Dana said in *The Sun*." Today we hear instead: "the Chicago *Daily News* said. . . ." Most of us do not know who owns, runs, or edits any particular paper or magazine. Who calls it "Ben Hibbs' *Saturday Evening Post*?" Whose *New Yorker* is it? Who edits *Look* or *Cosopolitan*? Does the man on the street think of it as "Fey's *Christian Century*" or "Walker's *Christian Life*?"

Frank L. Mott found evidence that seventy-three religious newspapers and at least twenty religious magazines were issued in 1828. Twenty years later there were almost three times that number of religious periodicals. "These weeklies," he points out, "competed with the secular weekly newspapers, and did not differ in appearance from them. They gathered news regularly, maintained correspondents in other cities, and covered secular

as well as sectarian happenings.”¹ Some great names were associated with these publications: John G. Palfrey, Nathaniel Parker Willis, Hosea Ballou, James Freeman Clarke, Orestes Brownson, John G. Whittier.

Christian Union was thought of as Lyman Abbott's magazine through most of its long and influential existence. For a short time, also, it was known as Henry Ward Beecher's, for that famous preacher was one of its first editors. The story of the *Christian Union* and of Abbott serves as an example of the change that has taken place in the realm of religious journalism in America. There is no duplicate for either the magazine or the editor, today. Possibly there never will be, since economic and social conditions are different than they were in the years between the end of the Civil War and the outbreak of World War I.

Abbott, like so many other religious journalists of his period, was a New Englander, born in 1835 at Roxbury, Massachusetts. One of the early graduates of New York University, his first experience in journalism was as a law reporter for the *New York Times* while associated with two lawyers, his brothers. His first creative writing was novels; he wrote two with those brothers. He abandoned law for the ministry when he came under the influence of Beecher, who was his pastor and whom, many years later, he succeeded as minister of Plymouth Congregational Church in Brooklyn.

Abbott's first serious journalistic venture was editing *The American Freedman*, a small newspaper issued monthly by an organization having new interest today, the American Freedman's Union Commission. It helped educate people of both races in the South. The editor spoke out for integrated schools, anticipating problems of a century later: “God grant to teach us by easier lessons the meaning of the words ‘equal rights,’” he wrote.² He thought it important to prepare freedmen for their responsibilities.

From this propaganda paper he went to the editorship of the literary department of *Harper's Monthly*, writing its book reviews. That was in 1868. The next year he moved from New York City, giving up the pastorate of a small Congregational church, and settled in Cornwall-on-Hudson. From that New York State town he contributed articles to *Harper's*, *The Independent*, *Christian Union*, and other papers and magazines, most of them religious in sponsorship. He also produced now

¹ Mott, Frank L., *A History of American Magazines*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930. Vol. I, p. 136.

² *American Freedman*, Vol. I, pp. 2-3, April 1866, as quoted in Ira V. Brown, *Lyman Abbott*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953, p. 46.

his first long book written alone: *Jesus of Nazareth: His Life and Teachings*. Later he wrote many other volumes on religious subjects which showed the effects of scientific and historical research by others, changing him from an orthodox, evangelical Protestant to a somewhat more liberal theologian.

Abbott's next important journalistic step was to take the editorship of a paper which has new interest for religious journalists today, although it is almost totally forgotten. This was the *Illustrated Christian Weekly*. Abbott, recalling the days when he became editor of it, declared in his reminiscences that the hope then was that the weekly "should differ from other religious weeklies by being illustrated and from other illustrated weeklies by being distinctly religious."³ That, of course, was the day of *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Weekly* and *Harper's Weekly*, so he was engaging in serious competition for public attention.

Lyman Abbott's regime on this paper began in 1871. It was an eight-pager, selling for a nickel. Timothy Cole did the woodblocks for it. When it was begun it said its purpose was to use the literary and graphic arts "to illustrate the great religious movements by which God is reconciling the world unto Himself" as well as to bring people in "living sympathy with human want and Christian work in the present."⁴ Its sponsor was the American Tract Society, a conservative, orthodox body. It refused advertising for the paper and encouraged its editor to deal with social, political, and religious topics.

As Abbott changed in his religious views, however, he found that editing the *Weekly* was less and less congenial to him, so he left it in 1876 to join Dr. Beecher on the *Christian Union*. His title was "associate editor," but it is evident from rereading his reminiscences that he and not Beecher was in fact the editor from the first. Beecher was having his troubles with the now famous scandal charges from which he later was exonerated. Abbott refused to take credit for the editing until he actually came into full charge in 1881. He held the post until his death in 1922.

A column in the *Illustrated Christian Weekly* while Abbott edited the paper was called "Outlook." Seeking to make *Christian Union* of more appeal to secular readers, Abbott changed the name of the magazine in 1893 and gave it as a title his old column's name. He also gave *The Outlook* more family appeal. It retained that title and that formula, with the addition of *New*, until its discontinuance in 1935. By that time ex-President Theodore Roosevelt had become contributing editor; and toward the end

³ Abbott, Lyman, *Reminiscences*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1915, p. 322.

⁴ *Illustrated Christian Weekly*, Vol. I, p. 90, April 15, 1871, as quoted in Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

of its life, having been merged with the even more famous religious journal, *The Independent*, and renamed *The Outlook and Independent*, it was edited by former Governor Alfred E. Smith.

The broader appeal of *The Outlook* under Abbott's nearly half-century of editorship demonstrates not only the changes in his philosophy but also the events in the lives of religious journals during the past century. As secular publishing firms became stronger, mainly through advertising (which they could command because of wider reading than ever before), they were able to give the public more appealing publications, obtain even wider distribution, and higher income. Secularism gained in the country and along with it the secular publications. Those religiously sponsored periodicals and papers that had broadened their base were better able to survive.⁵

But there were points beyond which religious journals could not go; they had to examine all subjects from the religious viewpoint; if they did not they no longer were religious. This necessity proved to be a limitation in the eyes of the public, which was losing interest in conventional religion. From this loss the journalism of the church never has recovered, for while several of today's religious papers and magazines have circulations around one million copies each and *The Outlook* never exceeded 130,000, it must be remembered that the population today is far greater than it was a half century ago and the potential, educationally, also is much higher.

Abbott's biographer, Dr. Brown, wrote in his study of the editor that *The Outlook* "under his editorship stood for a liberal religion, progressive politics, and a love of letters."⁶ How many religious periodicals of today fit that description? There are, to be sure, a number that stand for "a liberal religion," whatever that may mean (it has a meaning for this writer but it may not be the meaning of each reader). A few espouse "progressive politics," although that phrase also is fuzzy. "The love of letters" appears to exist in several. But can we find more than one or two that unite these three characteristics between their covers regularly and have made any significant impression upon the public?

I can think of only one clear candidate for the honor in the United States. This is a Catholic laymen's magazine, a weekly called *The Commonwealth*. From other countries there are a few candidates: *The British Weekly* in England comes to mind. But in the United States the

⁵ There is a modern parallel to this situation even within the secular journalistic world. After *The Saturday Review of Literature* dropped the words of *Literature* and began publishing materials about science, music, and business, its circulation increased remarkably.

⁶ Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

citizens have not, in this generation, been taught to turn to religious publications for guidance on public affairs. Nor could they have found much interpretation even had they sought it. Or maybe having sought they were disappointed. Church papers that editorialized on politics too often were damned as meddlers.

The religious viewpoint on public matters is either discredited or in far less demand than in Abbott's time. The situation cannot be explained away by the nature of the preaching in each period. There was great preaching in the Reconstruction years and it has been available ever since, today aided by radio. Is it that the public also does not get great leadership from either the religious or the secular press, except from a minority of publications, and has fallen out of the expectation of it from anything in printed form? The organs of secular leadership also are much less effective as guides or molders of public opinion than they used to be. The magazines of ideas—*The Nation*, *The New Republic*, *The New Leader*, *The Progressive*, and the few others of that group—barely hang on. While still influential far beyond the size of their circulations, the leadership they once exerted directly with the public is waning.

What chance is there, then, for *The Commonwealth*, *The Christian Century*, *America*, *Advance*, *The Churchman*, and others with strong editorial policies but making their principal appeal to religious readers? Religious people of any faith in this country are more or less the same middle-class readers who regularly trust the judgment of the editors of the *Reader's Digest*, *The Saturday Evening Post*, the *Ladies' Home Journal*, and several dozen other popular magazines of multi-million circulation (the combined circulations of all United States religious publications is estimated to be 15,000,000 copies; in that same month, one magazine, the *Reader's Digest* will sell nearly 20,000,000 copies of all its editions). The day when journalism was dominantly religious is past. It may never be seen again. As one looks over any quantity of those early newspapers and magazines one can conclude, sometimes, that it is just as well. For too often they were benighted sheets, full of bigotry, laden with long, rambling, and unproved arguments that actually once were sermons, and usually dull to try to read. But there were enough of the other kind—*The Outlook* kind—to make us realize that something important has been lost by the failure of the church bodies to enable their journals to hold the attention of the general public.

Why have these publications failed in that? For several reasons, most of which are not necessarily the fault of editors and publishers of these

religious papers. The worship of denominationalism is one reason. How many Methodists read publications issued by other denominations, for instance? Substitute the name of any denomination desired for "Methodist" in that sentence and the answer is still "practically none." Almost the only place in religious journalism where there is any cross-fertilizing of religious ideas and concepts is in the youth publication field, where editors often distribute each other's issues or use materials in common.

Another reason is the niggardly budget of the ordinary church publication, preventing the editors from making their publications physically more attractive and employing the best writers. A third is lack of advertising, a lack that cannot be corrected until the church press can offer either a much bigger audience for advertisers or provide a more intensive market not already reached by secular publications. A fourth is the absence in many offices of editors with journalistic knowhow, of promoters with promotion ability. And finally there is the temper of the people, which is not at this time one that looks to the church for guidance on many vital questions of the day.

Does it not appear, then, that the policy of the Church of Christ, Scientist, has all along been the right one, i.e., to issue a standard, secular publication of high order and to serve society by purveying news and views honestly and sincerely? For that is the function today of the *Christian Science Monitor*, now celebrating its fiftieth anniversary, a newspaper invariably listed among the top ten best dailies and almost always among the first few of the ten.

Is this dedication to good journalism for the use of all possibly not the true mission of print rather than only the publication of costly journals of denominational propaganda? There is mounting evidence that this point of view is being grasped by more and more editors of religious publications. *The Lutheran* demonstrates it by covering some secular as well as religious news. More and more articles of wide appeal are appearing in *Presbyterian Life*, *Christian-Evangelist*, *Jubilee*, *Unitarian Register*, *View*, *Christian Century*, *The Witness*, *Fellowship*, *Life and Health*, and several more, not excepting several score papers and magazines for children and youth. This policy, never so thoroughly followed as it has been by the *Monitor*, is familiar also in certain Roman Catholic newspapers, especially the *Brooklyn Tablet*, *Chicago World*, and *Boston Pilot*.

What is needed is a religious body, be it denominational or not, or even farsighted lay persons, interested in entering the world of publishing with the idea of duplicating the *Monitor*, but possibly serving smaller

geographical areas. If several dozen such courageous groups could be found we might have in different parts of this nation publications dedicated to the highest ideals of journalism. These would give adequate place to religion in their columns, but treat it like all other news. Similarly, church bodies might enter the magazine publishing business. If any secular journalist interprets this proposal as an accusation that the existing secular papers are not dedicated to the highest ideals of journalism let him answer this question: Are there any American cities that do not need newspapers as good as the *Monitor*? For unless the present papers are as good, new *Monitors* are necessary.

Publication of such new journals is a bold venture, not to be undertaken without long planning. As the experiments of the labor unions have shown, idealistic newspapers have hard going. The church-sponsored general publication would have to do without liquor advertising in a time when the trend is in the opposite direction. It could not press the button of loyalty to a denomination or some other religious group to get subscribers or readers or advertisers. It would begin operations in a time of mounting production costs. It would have to face the argument about church control of the press with the resulting impingements upon freedom of expression, a real danger.

Yet church bodies for many years have operated costly hospitals throughout the world and continue to do so. They for decades have paid the bills for one of the most expensive of all good works: schools and colleges. This time is one of crisis in Christian education, to be sure, but there is no intention to back completely out of it; instead, to find ways of hanging on.

Is not the power of the press great enough to command similar energy and devotion from the churches? Is it not just as important as any other tool of education and evangelization?

The Manual Acts in the Communion Service

JOHN C. BOWMER

IT IS GENERALLY AGREED that the climax of the service of Holy Communion comes at that point when the minister, reciting the Words of Institution, takes the bread and breaks it, and a few moments later, takes the cup and lifts it in his hands. These actions are known as the Manual Acts. They are observed in both Roman and Eastern Orthodox rites, and also by Lutherans, Anglicans and Presbyterians; but in Methodism custom varies, and for this reason it is timely for all who are interested in ways of worship to consider the significance of these actions and ask whether they belong to the essence of the rite or are merely peripheral detail.

I

To begin with, we set down the exact wording of the Manual Acts rubric as it is found in the earliest Methodist service book, Wesley's revision of the Book of Common Prayer, known as *The Sunday Service of the Methodists*. Here it is, the context being the Prayer of Consecration:

Who in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread (a); and when he had given thanks, he brake it (b) and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this (c) is my Body which is given for you; do this in remembrance of Me. Likewise, after supper, he took (d) the cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this (e) is my blood. . . .

- (a) Here the Elder is to take the Paten into his hands.
- (b) And here to break the bread.
- (c) And here to lay his hand on all the bread.
- (d) Here he is to take the cup in his hand.
- (e) And here to lay his hand upon the cup.

In the United States, the Methodist Episcopal Church retained the Manual Acts, though the Methodist Episcopal Church South dropped them in 1854. Many of the older ministers continued to observe them, but they gradually

JOHN C. BOWMER, M.A., B.D., is Minister of St. Margaret's Methodist Church, Whitley Bay, Northumberland, England. He states that in this article he is indebted to material from his former article in *The London Quarterly*, October, 1945, and to "Nolan B. Harmon's invaluable work," *The Rites and Ritual of Episcopal Methodism*, Nashville, Tenn., 1926.

died out. But they still appear in "The Ritual," where, in the first Order of Service for the Lord's Supper, they appear as follows:

who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread (1); and when he had given thanks he brake it and gave. . . . Likewise after supper he took the cup (2) and when he had given thanks. . . .

- (1) Here may the minister take the plate in his hands.
- (2) Here may the minister take the cup in his hands.

It will at once be noted that five actions are here reduced to two, and it is interesting to note which are retained and which omitted. The two retained are the simple actions of elevating the plate and the cup. One can understand why the two actions corresponding to (c) and (e) in Wesley's service book were omitted; they may suggest the miracle of transubstantiation. It is not so easy to understand why the action of breaking the bread was omitted, for this is the one which is so highly esteemed by Protestants and the one from which the whole service has been named "The Breaking of Bread." It is also to be noted that the rubrics are merely permissive ("may") and not directive ("shall" or "must"); also that they are omitted altogether from the second Order of Service.

So far as I am aware, the Manual Acts appeared in every copy of *The Sunday Service of the Methodists* which was published under Wesley's own supervision; although Nolan B. Harmon says that they are not to be found in certain copies of 1786. Dr. Harmon then quotes Peterson, "the historian of the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church South," as being of the opinion that they were not retained by Wesley at all. But the evidence of the earliest copies of *The Sunday Service* is that they were retained by Wesley; and we would agree with Dr. Harmon, who says, "If the Manual Acts were not included by Mr. Wesley in his Liturgy, it is difficult to account for their sudden appearance in 1792."¹

Confusion enters after Wesley's death. When Wesley passed away, all service books in British Methodism printed the Manual Acts; but by the middle of the nineteenth century editions were printed without them, and no consistency whatever is discernible as to whether they should be retained or omitted. Each Book Steward seems to have done that which was right in his own eyes and there was no "official version" of the Sunday Service. So great is the inconsistency that I have seen an edition as late as 1878 with the Manual Acts (the last to print them) and one of a much earlier date without them. By about 1880 the need was felt for an official version,

¹ *Rites and Ritual*, p. 73.

and in 1882 the Wesleyan Methodist Conference approved of a book which showed many and drastic revisions of Wesley's Sunday Service. There was a radical revision of the Baptismal Service; the Manual Acts were omitted from the Communion Service, and have not yet returned to British Methodist service books.

Why were they dropped? That is a question to which I've never been able to get a convincing reply, even from the late Dr. J. Scott Lidgett, who was active at the time of the revision. Certainly at the time (1882) there was an anti-Anglican movement led by Dr. J. H. Rigg which succeeded in removing all hints at baptismal regeneration from the Service of Holy Baptism and generally in removing as many traces of Anglican ritual as possible. The Oxford Movement was having its repercussions upon Methodism. Considerable alarm was felt in some quarters at the supposed danger of Anglo-Catholic tendencies creeping into Wesleyan Methodism. In any case, several left-wing tendencies revealed themselves, and the net result was that the Baptismal Service was amended, the Manual Acts dropped from the Communion Service, and three ministerial brethren seceded from the connection. When new service books were compiled for the reunited British Methodism in 1932, the restoration of the Manual Acts does not seem to have been contemplated.

II

Leaving Methodism for awhile, we might glance at the use of the Manual Acts in the Presbyterian service. The Presbyterians completely revised the Communion Service at the Reformation, following Calvin's Genevan rites, yet they have always retained a firm hold on the Words of Institution accompanied by the appropriate actions of the minister. A typical Presbyterian or Reformed Order of Service is that to be found in the Scottish Book of Common Order, as follows:

Then shall the Minister say:

ACCORDING to the holy institution, example and command of our Lord Jesus Christ, and for a memorial of Him, we do this: who in the same night in which He was betrayed,

TOOK BREAD (*here the minister shall take the bread into his hands*), and when He had blessed, and given thanks, HE BRAKE IT (*here he shall break the bread*) and said, TAKE EAT; THIS IS MY BODY, WHICH IS BROKEN FOR YOU: THIS DO IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.

After the same manner also, HE TOOK THE CUP (*here he shall raise the cup*) saying, THIS CUP IS THE NEW COVENANT IN MY BLOOD: THIS DO YE, AS OFT AS YE DRINK IT, IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.

We shall have occasion to refer both to this and to Wesley's Order again.

Now we must turn to a consideration of the history and purpose of the Manual Acts themselves. We begin with the scene in the Upper Room, when, referring first to the breaking of the bread, our Lord said, *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*—"This do" (Luke 22:19). In what may well be our earliest record of what happened at the Last Supper, Paul makes our Lord repeat the injunction over both the breaking of the bread and the blessing of the cup (I Cor. 11:24-25); and of even greater significance for our purposes are his words in I Cor. 10:16, "the cup of blessing which we bless . . . the bread which we break." The plurals *εὐλογοῦμεν* and *κλῶμεν* could refer to some communal action by the congregation, but they more naturally refer to an act done by the celebrant (presiding minister, elder, or bishop) as representing the congregation. If the reference had been to acts of the congregation, it seems Paul would more probably have written, "The cup of blessing that we drink."² At any rate here we have very early evidence of the early Christians perpetuating the actions of their Lord at the service which they named after one of those actions. Furthermore, it is certain that the rite as a whole was conceived of as "doing something" rather than saying or hearing something (though saying and hearing were, of course, involved). But the Eucharist was primarily an *action*—breaking, blessing, eating and drinking.³ The fact that the service came to be known as "the Breaking of Bread" (as it still is in some quarters) suggests that from the earliest days, some prominence was given to this particular feature.

Further back than the Upper Room we need not go at present, though the antecedents of what our Lord did there will be found to lie in Jewish blessings and sacramental meals. Or we may even have to trace it to the symbolic acts of the prophets—for example, Jeremiah's breaking of the earthenware jar—which are "instrumental acts, helping to bring about that which they signify."⁴

Nothing is more certain than that, from the earliest post-Resurrection meetings of the disciples, the bread was broken in memory of their Lord. This action became an essential part of the meal which was soon celebrated as the significant and unique act of Christian worship. With the development of that worship in the fourth century, it became greatly elaborated. In the Gallican and Mozarabic rites, for example, the particles of broken bread were arranged as a cruciform figure; usually there were seven or nine

² See Plummer, A., *Corinthians*, International Critical Commentary, p. 212.

³ See Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London: The Dacre Press, 1945, p. 12.

⁴ Robinson, H. Wheeler, *Redemption and Revelation*. Harper & Brothers, 1942, p. 250.

pieces, each with a particular designation corresponding to some mystery in the life of Christ. In the Eastern Church the "fraction" (as the ceremony of the Breaking of Bread was called) was always a highly elaborate ceremony. In the medieval Roman Church, however, the Manual Acts were somewhat overshadowed in significance by the Elevation of the Host, which came to be regarded with superstitious awe.

From the Roman or Western liturgy, the Manual Acts passed into the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, which was the immediate ancestor of Wesley's Sunday Service. There were no instructions for their performance until 1662, for the 1549 edition simply instructed the priest to take the bread and cup into his hands, and the 1552 edition omitted even these two rubrics. In connection with their restoration in 1662, it is interesting to note it was largely owing to the insistence of the Puritans that they were restored. It was one of the concessions granted by the Bishops in reply to Baxter's Savoy Liturgy, which itself was a compromise between Anglican and Genevan rites. The Puritan Party demanded that the Manual Acts be done "in the sight of the people"; words which were later modified to "before the people." In this matter, of course, the Puritans were followers of Calvin and Knox, both of whom retained the Manual Acts in their liturgies.

The Genevan rite differed from the Anglican in that in Genevan churches the Communion Service was conducted by the minister standing *behind* the Table—as in Presbyterian churches today. This is known as the "Basilican Posture" and was regarded as being more primitive and truer to the idea of Justin Martyr's *προεστός* (president): "a president does not usually turn his back upon those over whom he is presiding."⁵ Presbyterian custom has also adopted the procedure whereby the Manual Acts are not embedded in the Prayer of Consecration, but so arranged that they accompany the Narrative of Institution as it is read by the minister (see quotation from the Book of Common Order, quoted above).

III

This last point raises an interesting question. Against the position of the Manual Acts in the Anglican and Methodist services it is contended that as they are performed during the Prayer of Consecration, when people's eyes are closed in prayer, they can mean nothing to the worshipers. The position is this:

⁵ Maxwell, W. D., *John Knox's Genevan Service Book*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1931, p. 47.

1. The Book of Common Prayer places the Manual Acts within the Prayer of Consecration. The structure and atmosphere of this office is Catholic rather than Reformed. There is always the lingering belief that something is done to the elements by the words and actions of the episcopally ordained priest—call the “something” transubstantiation or what you will. Technically, consecration was held to be effected by the Epiclesis in the East and by the recital of the words *Hoc est corpus meum* in the West, but the Manual Acts are not dissociated from it. In any case, the actions of the priest are performed and are efficacious whether the people see them or not. If the eyes of the worshipers are closed in prayer, they do not, of course, see what the priest is doing. At the same time we must not take the closed eyes for granted, for Dr. Percy Dearmer points out that the Lincoln judgment requires that the actions be done with some degree of prominence: “If any ceremonial is to be visible to the people, that action of Christ’s unquestionably ought to be so.”⁶ Dr. Dearmer also confirms what we said above, that it was the Puritans who, in 1661, pressed for the wording of the rubric, “in the sight of all the people.” The position of the Manual Acts within the Prayer of Consecration is one of the anomalies of the Anglican rite which is rectified in the Reformed Orders of Service.

2. The Reformers rejected the idea that something was done to the elements by the imposition of priestly hands or the recitation of specified words. So they arranged the service so that the Words of Institution and three Manual Acts did not occur within a prayer but were read as a declaration by the minister. The background of belief here is not the magic of the priestly touch but that the minister should preside over what is really a re-enactment of the drama of the Upper Room. The people are not in the posture of prayer, they can see what the minister is doing. Thus the Manual Acts are retained without any suggestion of transubstantiation; an arrangement which, we would suggest, is much more satisfactory than that of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer.

This, then, is the position today, with the two different approaches to the question of the Manual Acts in the Communion Service. All that remains for us to do now is to set down very briefly a few considerations which might justify our making the fullest use of these symbolic gestures in our Communion Services.

1. The Manual Acts are symbols in a service where symbolism

⁶ Dearmer, Percy, *Parson's Handbook*. Oxford, 1931, p. 339.

abounds. The white linen cloth, the covered elements, the kneeling to receive Communion (where kneeling is the custom), the delivery of the elements into the hands of the people, all have a part in the high drama. Such symbolism is full of meaning and ought not to be belittled. Rightly understood and reverently interpreted, the Manual Acts, as all symbols, say what no words can utter. They are eloquent when words are a clumsy medium of expression. "The actions in the Eucharist have this dramatic and poetic value and they must not be robbed of their power."⁷ Dr. W. H. Frere, in an attempt to classify the different kinds of ceremonial, places the Manual Acts under the heading of "Interpretive Ceremonial"; that is, "They take place while words are being said and they serve to bring out their meaning more clearly, or else to indicate some point in connexion with the words that needs to be brought out."⁸

2. The Manual Acts give rightful prominence to the elements. The bread and the wine are not mere adjuncts to the service, but, at the climax to which the pre-Communion and the Prayer of Humble Access move, they are brought to the immediate attention of the worshipers.

3. The Manual Acts are in line with the best Reformed tradition. The work of the Reformers was to preserve the essentials of the rite after these had been evaluated and sifted from the accretions which had grown up around the service during the Middle Ages. We must beware of thinking of our Communion Service in such a way that "those august and primitive actions which the Reformers were burnt to win for us from the confused millinery of the Mass are not now thought worth repeating." These are the words of that great Christian, Bernard Manning. He also points out: "The Reformation. . . . on the one hand abandoned all rites that bore no direct and obvious reference to the supper. On the other hand (and this was more important) it emphasized the few actions which make the celebration."⁹ The Manual Acts, we would suggest, are among "the few actions which make the celebration."

4. The Manual Acts are like a golden thread, running from the Upper Room on "that dark betrayal night" through the celebrations down the centuries under various names—the Breaking of Bread, the Lord's Supper, the Eucharist, the Liturgy, the Holy Communion, the Mass—one element of unity amid so much diversity. If a first-century Christian could enter one of our churches when a Communion Service is in progress, he

⁷ Hislop, D. H., *Our Heritage in Public Worship*. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935, p. 234.

⁸ Frere, W. H., *Principles of Religious Ceremonial*. London: Mowbray, 1906, 1928, p. 117.

⁹ See *Essays in Orthodox Dissent*. London: Independent Press, pp. 55, 61.

would not understand the language (not even the Latin of the Roman Church); the hymns would sound strange to his ears and the architecture would look strange to his sight; but if he could see the minister break the bread and take the cup, he would, we feel sure, know what was taking place. He would not need to be told that he was in a Christian service.

We do not, of course, suggest that such a visit is a possibility to be reckoned with, but we would suggest that these acts belong to no particular sect or denomination of Christianity; certainly they are not the monopoly of any "high church" party or of a band of ritualists. They are not distinctly Roman or Anglican, for they have been, and still are, an integral part of what is a unique Christian act of worship as it has been performed since those first Christians in the Acts of the Apostles "broke bread from house to house" (Acts 2:46).

Without presuming to act the part of our Lord, without pretending that there is magic in the ministerial touch, we would claim that these simple actions ought to find their place in every Communion Service. In the Methodist Ritual their performance is optional; the minister "may" perform them or he may not. Much depends upon his own sense of their usefulness and appropriateness; but at least it can be said that those ministers, of whatever denomination, who do use the Manual Acts are maintainers of a great Reformed tradition.

Commentary

TO THE EDITOR OF RELIGION IN LIFE

Dear Sir:

In a recent article Professor Winston L. King made a healthy criticism of biblical theologians, of their haziness and lack of clarity on some essential points.¹ His article was a presentation of four questions which he asked biblical theologians: "Is the Bible a unity? Is there 'progressive revelation' in the Bible? Can biblical fact be distinguished from poetry and biblical history from interpretation? Does God's moral character change?"

Many discrepancies appeared within his article, however, among which was his fourfold quoting out of context from the writings of G. Ernest Wright,² for which—a close examination reveals—the conclusions to which Professor King came are largely responsible.

Elaborating on two of these instances, we note first that the article accuses Professor Wright of confusing fact and interpretation:

"I have great difficulty, therefore, with the following statement of Wright's: 'The inference [to God's activity] was an interpretation of an event, which to Israel became an integral part of the event and which thus could be used for the comprehending of subsequent events.' When an inference (that it was God acting) becomes 'part of the event,' which, because of what this interpreted event tells of God, enables us to forecast [*sic*] the future and interpret it, we seem to be moving in a circle."³

Here Professor King has extracted a statement from a *particularized* context and *generalized* it. Professor Wright does not say that Israel "makes inferences" as a general theological method. He speaks specifically of Israel's doctrine of election. A selection from the whole context of Professor Wright's passage will suffice to clarify what Professor King has done.

"If the primary and irreducible assumption of Biblical theology is that history is the revelation of God, then we must affirm that the first inference to be drawn from this view was not concerned solely with the power and attributes of God, but rather with the explanation of what God had done at the Exodus. That is, the initial and fundamental theological inference was the doctrine of the chosen people. The use of the term 'inference' here does not mean that Israel was consciously employing a method of reasoning by logical deduction in the philosophical or Greek sense. The inference was an interpretation of an event, which to Israel became an integral part of the event and which thus could be used for the comprehension of subsequent events. How else could Israel explain what had happened except by a conception of election?

"The faith in a special election was one which always pointed forward to a future in which the full purpose of God would be manifest."⁴

In a second instance, Professor King writes:

¹ King, W. L., "Some Ambiguities in Biblical Theology," *RELIGION IN LIFE*, Winter 1957-1958, pp. 95-104.

² Wright, G. E., *God Who Acts* (Alec R. Allenson, 1956), *The Old Testament Against Its Environment* (Alec R. Allenson, 1955), and "Progressive Revelation," *The Christian Scholar*, March, 1956, pp. 61-65.

³ King, W. L., *op. cit.*, pp. 98-99.

⁴ Wright, G. E., *God Who Acts*, pp. 50-51, to which W. L. King refers.

"Wright, with regard to the thunderings and lightnings at Sinai, tells us: 'to historicize such images in such a way as to make one assume that Sinai was actively volcanic, and therefore to be sought in Arabia' is as foolish as to institute a search for 'the mountains that melted like wax when Yahweh passed over the hills of the earth,' as recorded in Psalms 29:6. Or to assume that the expression in a Psalm, 'Lebanon danced like a wild bull,' indicates its volcanic nature. Throughout Wright's work, indeed, is a tendency to 'spiritualize' all anthropomorphisms relating to God."⁵

Here Professor King accuses Professor Wright of "spiritualizing" when (he should have seen had he examined the context of his quote) the latter is attacking the "literalizing" of the ancient Near-Eastern mind. Professor Wright, speaking of the *epithets* given to God—some reworked from Canaanite sources—says that to historicize such epithets is foolish. Historical material in the Old Testament is a different matter. But Professor King here seems to confuse epithets of God with anthropomorphic descriptions of God's historical acts. Some of these epithets may have historical connotations; but to rest a case for historical knowledge on them rather than on the Old Testament *historical* matter leaves something to be desired in the way of good scholarship.

Without belaboring the point further, let it suffice to say that, if the reader wishes to examine Professor King's other two quotes of Professor Wright's material, he will discover that these also are quoted out of context, in a more confused manner, but are less significant to this discussion.⁶

Clearly, Professor King, having quoted Professor Wright out of context, cannot claim more than a superficial and isogetical understanding of Professor Wright's works.

Yet the problem here is deeper than "some ambiguities in biblical theology" and deeper than one writer's quoting another out of context. It is precisely that of understanding another point of view which stands in quite different perspective from one's own. And this type of understanding demands that one see another's work as a whole, while penetrating within its details. It is our opinion that Professors Wright and Anderson would have been best understood if they had been evaluated in regard to their central theses expressed in their works, and also in the light of recent biblical scholarship and research and factual data.

Every theological position has its own character; and, in conclusion, it cannot be understood by grasping at phrases and sentences which, when abstracted from their context and placed in another setting, are naturally meaningless.

Yours truly,

KARL W. GILLMEISTER
AND CHARLES G. YOPST

McCormick Theological Seminary
Chicago, Illinois

⁵ King, W. L., *op. cit.*, pp. 99-100, quoting from G. Ernest Wright's "God Who Acts," note p. 47; also *The Old Testament Against Its Environment*, note 19, p. 21, quoting J. Pedersen."

⁶ King, W. L., *op. cit.*, pp. 96-97, and 102.

Book Reviews and Notices

The Psychology of Religion. An Introduction to Religious Experience and Behavior. By WALTER HUSTON CLARK. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958. xii-485 pp. \$5.95.

There is probably no more difficult text to write than a Psychology of Religion, and this all the more so in our own day. For the writer, as a responsible psychologist, must feel the cold if not hostile stare of many colleagues whose commitment to operational criteria of psychological truth makes them feel that no psychology worthy of the name can be written in the field of religion—an area of human behavior to be psychologized away rather than about! That the Dean and Professor of Psychology in the Hartford School of Religious Education (Hartford Seminary Foundation) is fully aware of such psychological positivism and skepticism is clear, and he is to be congratulated for boldly asking his colleagues no longer to neglect an area of human experience which is so influential that, if they continue to ignore it, they may continue to get scientifically accurate results in the peripheries of human concern but continue to be almost irrelevant at the moving centers of human experience.

Professor Clark himself, therefore, courageously enters into a complex arena armed with a scientifically but not positivistically sharpened sword with which he has cut away much in this area which parades as truth and fact. He is aware of the relatively small number of significant factual studies in this area, sensitive to the needs for better studies than are now available on various aspects of religious behavior, and usually quite cautious about conclusions to be drawn from factual studies.

This book, therefore, seems to be the best available survey of the field of psychology of religion as a whole, without being a mere survey. Dean Clark treats the growth of religion from childhood through adolescence to adulthood, the phenomena of conversion, mysticism, prayer, worship, the criteria for mature religion (personal and organized), and the relation of religion to psychotherapy. But throughout his treatment of phenomena he develops the consequences of the three underlying stages in the development of religion in a given life: *primary*, direct religious experience, *secondary* religious behavior (the habits and religious observances which the believer connects with the original experience), and *tertiary* religious behavior (which, largely lacking personal experience of the divine, is the result of conditioning or imitation, and tends to produce the "respectable" churchgoer who never knows religion as a fire in his bones or an "acute fever"). The beginning student will, accordingly, find a suggestive survey of significant areas of religious psychology, the pastor and religious teacher will find much to reward his reading time, and the psychologist who is interested in the relation of motivation to personality organization will find challenge even when he is dissatisfied.

In making the next two critical comments, the reviewer realizes that he is asking for a great deal at this stage of psychological inquiry, but over and over again he was impressed by the following needs which must be met in this field. Simply to suggest the first: There is an aching need for a systematic theory of personality in terms of which studies and "phenomena" may be interpreted and which itself has definite relation to these varied and conflicting data. Would that there were space to expatiate here. But a careful psychology cannot be satisfied with talking about the environmental influences from which religion emerges, with no adequate analysis of moral and esthetic

experience, nor can it disregard the differences in the *definition of human nature and personality at the outset* which may be entailed by the possibility (at least) that man can experience the non-sensory agencies to which religion in the primary sense points. There are, to be sure, tough epistemological issues at hand, but if psychology is ever to grow up to the measure of human nature, it cannot *presuppose* a naturalistic and reductionist viewing of man, of human need and capacities, but must at least be ever aware that "the givens" of human nature, as suggested by moral, esthetic, and religious experience, are richer than those implied in biological or Darwinian-Freudian categories.

But, granting that the previous comment calls for a long-run program, this second does not. Dean Clark defines religion "as the inner experience of the individual when he senses a Beyond ['most probably personal in nature!'] especially evidenced by the effect of this experience on his behavior when he actively attempts to harmonize his life with the Beyond." While the reviewer himself shares the Christian perspective of Dean Clark, and agrees with most of the value judgments about religion Dean Clark suggests—in this book, on page after page, the shift in analysis and interpretation is made without warning from this *general* definition of religion to a specific framework which is the Judeo-Christian loving Father of all men. This shift is unfortunate and misleading. For if the Hindu, Mohammedan, let alone Confucian and Buddhist views of "a Beyond" were in focus, Clark's descriptions and interpretations of faith, prayer, mystical experience, mature religion, and of conversion and psychotherapy would need a great deal of transformation or reinterpretation.

To cite two of many instances of this narrowing of the religious frame of reference: the contact between a good psychotherapeutic relation and religious psychotherapy is in terms of God as "the Good Counsellor" (cf. 385), and the interpretation of the religious attitude toward suffering is from a view of life which is more consonant with a Christian world view than any other.

While this pervasive orientation makes this a more useful book for Christians, it underscores the fundamental dilemma in which a psychologist of religion works. But it might also lead him to reconceive the whole task of psychology of religion. For one may well ask: Since what is given and interpreted in the primary religious experience is a motivating and meaning focus of the experient's life, what his "religious psychology" is will depend on how he conceives the "Beyond," metaphysically and value-wise. If this is so, the psychology of religion of a Vedantist Hindu will differ importantly and be "true" in a different sense from that of other Hindus, and that of Hindus from Christians. Can we not make more headway, scientifically and religiously, if we realize that a psychology of religion must pivot around the particular conception of the Beyond believed in, and relate this to the structure and development of personality?

PETER A. BERTOCCI

Borden Parker Bowne Professor of Philosophy, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts.

Person and Reality. An Introduction to Metaphysics. By EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN. Edited by Peter A. Bertocci in collaboration with Jannette E. Newhall and Robert S. Brightman. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1958. x-379 pp. \$6.50.

Among Professor Brightman's many and influential books, this one, which he did not live to complete, will without doubt be first in future discussion and influence.

His students and friends know the determination with which he worked through successive drafts of it in his last years, and the great importance which he attached to it as the reasoned statement and defense of the basic principles to which his thinking and teaching always returned. It is a distinguished work in metaphysics, developed with firmness, breadth, and clarity, and will be taken for a definitive formulation of American personalism, which has played so long and effective a role in Christian liberalism.

Professor Brightman was able to complete only thirteen of the eighteen chapters which he had planned, and the following four were skillfully put together by the editors from versions which he had left incomplete and appropriate selections from his earlier books and articles. It is good to have some of Brightman's most brilliant, and in several instances most witty, writing embodied in this most closely reasoned philosophical exposition of his thought. Inevitably certain shifts in terminology and even in argument become apparent. For example, the theory of a finite God, fully developed in *A Philosophy of Religion* (1940), is retained along with the theory of multiple meanings, first presented in *An Introduction to Philosophy* (1925) before the doctrine of a limited God had been developed—which implies a God able to express his moral purposes even in co-operating in the evil actions of men. In every such case of contrasting positions, however, a proper perspective on the development of Brightman's thought is preserved by the editors' footnotes.

The book is distinguished for thoroughness and richness of insight rather than for newness of doctrine. Professor Brightman's deftness in the use and criticism of philosophical literature is as conspicuous as ever; the breadth of his mastery was remarkable. The doctrines for which he has long been known—a dualistic epistemology, the coherence criterion of truth (an Hegelian doctrine used in a very un-Hegelian way), the personalization of experience and its sharp separation from reason, the critical realism, the refutations of naturalism and absolutism, the argument for God's existence based on value norms, and the conception of a personal God whose acts are eternally limited by a Given within his own nature—all are here developed within the context of the traditional problems of metaphysics. But certain advances beyond earlier expositions may be noted.

First there is a consistent effort to demonstrate the method of empirical coherence in the total argument of the book; it moves systematically, though with complex reasoning from the analysis of the empirical datum (the momentary self), through its cautious extension in alternative philosophical hypotheses, and the weighing of these alternative hypotheses for their relative coherence, to the argument that personalism, being more concrete or organic than alternative theories, is the superior metaphysical theory. (Here the question seems to be begged by the identification of an organic logical unity of judgment with the organic whole of a personal experience.) In the next place, Professor Brightman has used two complementary devices in the organization of his argument: to the analysis and interpretation of the metaphysical categories traditional to personalistic metaphysics, he has, following a metaphysical fashion introduced by Santayana, added the examination of the so-called realms of being. In the judgment of this reviewer, the former approach is more compatible with Brightman's method than the latter, which usually implies an intuitive givenness of the "realms." Finally, there is a noteworthy shift in Brightman's terminology which involves the introduction of a metaphor: the entire personalistic argument is developed in terms of an interaction between the "shining present" (in former works "the datum self") to which experience is restricted, and the "illuminating absent" (the entire realm

of the *real*, not given in experience, but bound together by the self-transcending thought of the "shining present").

Now this metaphor, it seems, will not do. Its intent is to suggest that it is the illumination of the absent that enables the present experience not merely to shine, but to reason and to act out the implications of its shining. The absent is in interaction with the present; in part it "controls," in part "is controlled" by it. Reality is never given; epistemologically it is a structure of coherence hypotheses, but metaphysically, a society of co-operating persons. And only the very unempirical and open-ended relation of "objective reference" is offered to close the gap between my hypothesis and reality. Brightman's epistemological dilemma is as old as Ockham, who knew "that nothing can be represented (i.e., referred to) by something else unless it has already been known," but whose own efforts to reason from subjectively defined experience opened the door to modern skepticism. The lesson is clear in James's radical empiricism, which Brightman explicitly adopts, but which led James himself logically to phenomenism.

There is another trend in Brightman's thinking, however, which points to an epistemological theory of immediacy. The theory of perspectives which he several times introduces but does not further develop suggests it, and his discussion of value norms and essences sometimes makes it explicit. "Norms are objective and are valid for all persons. . . . They are, to quote Whitehead, 'eternal objects'" (p. 226). Such passages, which occur frequently, point to a theory which is hardly consistent with his rejection (p. 71) of any view "that there must be moments in my shining present when the object known must be in some sense or degree literally one with my experience."

In the very valuable concluding Chapter Eighteen of *Person and Reality* Professor Bertocci has written a brilliant summary which might well have been entitled "In the Spirit of Edgar Brightman." Here he has replied to several criticisms, including the argument, suggested above, that Brightman's epistemology does not support his theory of metaphysical interaction and co-operation. Yet it is in the spirit of Brightman, too, to view personalism as a living philosophy, whose life depends upon continued examination, critical analysis, and reinterpretation. The personalistic tradition has brought light and moral conviction to many. But as critical metaphysics it will no doubt continue to adjust itself to new intellectual and cultural currents, and produce internal dialectic tensions. As his own works show abundantly, and as his inspired teaching persuaded his students, Brightman always viewed his own contributions in this light.

LEROY E. LOEMKER

Professor of Philosophy, Emory University, Georgia.

For Faith and Freedom. Gifford Lectures: 2 Volumes. By LEONARD HODGSON. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957, 1958. vii-237 pp. \$4.75.

Lord Gifford had hardly written the document which established the Lectureship bearing his name, when the categories with which he defined its scope became embarrassing. The supposed clear dichotomy between "natural" and "revealed" theology became blurred and increasingly imprecise. By the second quarter of the century following, a Gifford lecturer (Karl Barth) was to make the customary salutations to the trustees of the lectureship by explicitly denying that there is any such thing as natural theology.

In the series of these lectures given by Leonard Hodgson, Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, one sees a sensitivity to the irrelevance of the old dichotomy joined with profound unease at some of the recently proposed alternatives. Indeed, *For Faith and Freedom* has a typical Anglican atmosphere both in its tolerant, irenic and urbane tone and in its delicacy over pressing any argument too rudely, especially its own.

Volume I begins with a review of certain debates over the credentials of revelation, the recent use of the term and its relation to natural theology, its role *vis à vis* linguistic philosophy, and biblical theology. This opening review is apt to be deceptive, for it is precisely here that Hodgson defines the ground and stakes out his own view of how we are to use "revelation" and "reason"—the view in light of which he subsequently deals, under the heading of natural theology, with creation, space, time, matter and spirit, freedom and evil, and, as Christian theology, with more specifically doctrinal questions.

In the space available it is of course impossible to give any adequate impression of the illumination afforded by these two volumes—light that is shed by the sweetly reasonable argument upon every sector of the contemporary theological landscape, many of them already heatedly and inconclusively fought over with teutonic fury.

However, I think any claim to originality which may be made for *For Faith and Freedom* derives chiefly from Hodgson's view of the relation between what has been traditionally called "revelation" and "reason," revealed theology and natural theology. Therefore I want to raise a question or two about this, precisely because I find his view both congenial and full of difficulties.

Briefly, Hodgson wishes to discard the "natural-revealed" dichotomy and to claim that ". . . all theology which has any truth in it is . . . both natural and revealed. Christian theology should be thought of as a specific form of natural theology, differentiated by its seeing in certain events particular acts of God of unique and supreme significance for our understanding of everything." (Vol. II, pp. 3-4.)

Now, the great virtue of this formulation, both apologetic and dogmatic, is, first, that with it the by now fruitless quarrel over the abstractions "reason" and "revelation" is short-circuited; and, second, that the logical differences between Christian statements about God are seen as just that—*logical* differences—and are therefore made subject to logical scrutiny. The difficulty for Hodgson, however, is that of making a *new* distinction which is not *merely* logical; not merely, that is to say, a matter of different languages, images, the tense of Hebrew verbs and/or the syntax of Hellenistic Greek. He seems to suspect that the biblical theologians in their zeal to exhibit the radical difference between biblical and other concepts come down at the end to saying that accepting Jesus Christ as Lord is a matter of accepting a certain syntax! For him, the distinctively Christian is a content, not a form.

Quite apart from the absurdity of laying such a charge to the biblical theologians, I believe Hodgson is in trouble with his own alternative. We must, says he, remember that we are not talking about language but about that which "God has done" and which "cannot be altered or undone" (Vol. I, p. 89), to which men in all times, including the Hebrews, have made reference with their own language. But the dispute is over just precisely "what God has done"—or over whether he has in fact done anything, and this inevitably becomes a dispute over the meaningfulness of certain concepts, i.e., a dispute over the use of words—or at least a learning of a common use of words. Is not Hodgson's own argument very largely a series of

verbal recommendations, by following which one sees something new concerning that which language is "about"? Further, suppose Harnack on his premises or Cullmann on his were to rejoin that other cultures have misinterpreted what "God had done"—what kind of dispute would this be for Hodgson? How could it be settled?

WILLIAM H. POTEAT

Professor of Philosophical Theology and Christian Criticism, The Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest, Austin, Texas.

America as a Civilization. By MAX LERNER. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957. xiii-1036 pp. \$10.00.

It is encouraging to note a number of recent volumes which seek to interpret American society as a whole, rather than remain content with nibbling off small units of specialized areas for their research labors. *America as a Civilization* is one of those large-sized books which all too frequently occupies a conspicuous space on an informed reader's bookshelf, but, alas, remains largely unread! Encyclopedic in nature, comprehensive in scope, the volume is a sweeping commentary on the American scene. Lerner, the dabbler in various phases of American life (as journalist, editor, philosopher, educator, and political actionist), serves as a skillful guide through the course of over 1,000 pages, covering every major, and some minor, facets of life, thought, manners, and behavior in these United States.

In some respects this significant work is itself symptomatic of our times: it symbolizes a growing concern with trying to understand ourselves and to wrestle with the question of who we are as a people; it is the fruit of an interdisciplinary approach which is gaining ascendancy in our "behavioral sciences"; it is eclectic to the core, a synthesis of the writings and findings of some 150 "authorities," a product of "team-work." Finally, it is a work which takes seriously the perilous role of America in the modern world. Despite its seriousness, though, various passages will cause us to laugh at ourselves ("nation of joiners"), to take pride in our achievements, and to be shocked by our stupidity and insensitivity.

In view of the themes treated by the book, it will inevitably be compared with the works of those "acute foreign observers," De Tocqueville, Siegfried, Bryce, Laski, Müller-Freienfels, Brogan, and Maritain. Whether Lerner's more prodigious volume will rank with, say, De Tocqueville's, is indeed a moot point. But this much is certain in the mind of this reviewer. We Americans have a peculiar propensity to accept the observations of foreign critics, while we cast aspersions on those of an indigenous one. Yet there are signs of a turning of the tide, and a Commager or a Whyte, a Riesman or a Lerner can give us much self-understanding, whether or not we happen to like or agree with them.

Moreover, the Lerner volume contains a quality that none of the foreign critics could possibly have included to the same degree, namely, the capturing of the dynamic social changes wrought by various revolutions (organizational, mass media, suburbia, automation, leisure) which have virtually transformed American life and thought. An understanding of the impact of these newer developments in the American social scene is of the utmost importance for those who would seek to minister to, and to mold the future shape of, its citizenry and its civilization.

Of course, a book which covers so many aspects of contemporary American culture is bound to contain gaps and areas which are barely sketched in outline form.

The specialist in a given area, say on class stratification, or urbanization, or religious life in America (particularly religious institutions), will find that Lerner's treatment is too brief, almost to the point of distortion. Certainly, one would have liked to see a point expanded here, or a contention elaborated there. Another source of criticism will stem from the overly meticulous scholars, who find the book objectionable because it transgresses the bounds of specialized fields and is too general in its subject matter; to this reviewer, critique based on such grounds is spurious. Lerner's volume must be evaluated in the light of his own inner logic and purpose.

In this light, one central thread of interpretation ought to be challenged, namely, the celebration of diversity and pluralism of American society in which Lerner seems to wallow (e.g., "The pluralism of American churches is like the pluralism of America's regions, its diverse economic forms, its political localism, its ethnic and immigrant stocks," p. 711). Space limitations prevent the reviewer from full documentation, but it must simply be stated that for each of these pluralistic tendencies singled out by Lerner, there are potent countertrends, which in nearly all cases, under searching analysis, are more dominant. The author overlooks the significant signs of a unity and a cultural homogeneity. This emerging unity of American society is crucial to an understanding of the various phases of life dealt with by Lerner.

The serious student of society is advised, nay, urged, to examine the "Notes for Further Reading," which constitute nearly fifty pages of small-typed annotated bibliographical sources—an indispensable listing of major works and many fugitive journal articles.

Max Lerner is to be commended for undertaking this monumental task. So that his labors might, in some measure, be justified, here is one reviewer who will take the volume off the top bookshelf frequently, and check his ideas against the views succinctly presented in this highly readable and massive reference work.

ROBERT LEE

Assistant Professor of Church and Community, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939. By ROBERT MOATS MILLER. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958. xiv-385 pp. \$6.00.

There is no happier union than historical research and literary skill, and in Professor Miller (of the University of North Carolina) we have it. The wealth of quotations from laymen and ministers who gave utterance to Protestant humor and concern with the life of their times in the Golden Twenties and the Depression Thirties puts the reader in the author's debt for his shrewd and sensitive feeling for the people and conditions of the period. The book's actual scope is what was said and done, officially and unofficially, in the thirteen major denominations in America in the interbellum period on five scores: civil liberties, labor-capital, race relations, war and peace, and ideologies. (An exception is the "Footnote to the Election of 1928," pages 48-62, dealing with prohibition and bigotry in Protestant politics.)

Entertaining as his treatment is, Professor Miller is never merely flip. He begins his account of American Protestant activism and Theodore Parker's dictum that ours is "a religion that rises every morning and works all day," and how its social expressions have been up and down as well as back and forth: for example, as the Social Gospel gained momentum, racial segregation hardened! Those who came

up in these two decades will be struck, perhaps, with the realization that the churches did not, in the "Roarin' Twenties," become merely a picture of Babbittonian Captivity (a la Sinclair Lewis) and contented corpulence; that they were less so than they are now in the Fat Fifties, when they seem to be writing into the creed, "Come weal, come woe, my status is quo." With the present drive on for sheer numbers, we show more evidence than ever for Henry Sloane Coffin's remark that many of the clergy appear to have become ranchers rather than shepherds.

The book certainly shows us that the twenties and fifties are much alike as postwar decades, with the churches worshiping the "bitch goddess Success." The chief difference, one suspects, is that the radical leadership of the churches in the twenties is lacking in the fifties as a corrective.

Taking Reinhold Niebuhr as a prototype of the social concern of Protestantism in the thirties, Miller describes him as "to the right in theology and to the left in politics." Miller does not try to cope with the obvious observation that something had to "give," and what broke down was the radical politics! Thus in *Christian Faith and Social Action* (1953), a symposium edited by John Hutchinson, Niebuhr openly declared that he had come to think that "the whole question of social ethics" is "problematic" and wondered whether there are "any criteria whereby we can judge" between conflicting social forces!

Some readers who know that story Miller is recounting may wonder why he sees so little significance in the rise and fall of the United Christian Council for Democracy, and neglects it. Again, without any documentation, he retails a canard about Claude Williams (p. 106) which has been challenged and discredited repeatedly. In his primary source material, for some reason, he completely disregards *The Witness*, chief source of information for that period on Episcopal activities and controversies. His unpublished manuscript sources do not include the Moran Weston one at Columbia. He has, some will think, failed to appreciate how the drift of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians from left to right mirrors the whole story he is telling. But these are critical matters and possible moot ones at that. Rarely do we get as competent and entertaining a book as this one, remarkably balanced, for the most part, in spite of the short lapse of time. Twenty years is none too long for perspective's sake.

JOSEPH FLETCHER

Professor of Christian Ethics, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Church Faces the Isms. Ed. by ARNOLD B. RHODES. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958. 304 pp. \$4.50.

As a member of the faculty of a sister seminary, this reviewer can only look with wonder at the faculty of the Louisville Presbyterian Seminary for its production of this book. For these essays reveal a coherence of outlook and of approach, and so a mutual understanding, rare in any group of men, and extraordinary in a faculty.

In this volume the eleven authors attempt to describe, interpret and appraise the wide variety of "faiths" and "viewpoints" ("isms") which are either deviations from or direct antagonists of what they call "main line Protestantism." Thus such isms as Fundamentalism, Adventism, the Healing Sects, Judaism, Roman Catholicism,

Totalitarianism, Naturalism, and many others, are discussed. The articles are written with objectivity and fairness, in each case the good aspects of the ism in question being scrupulously listed with the bad. In many cases, especially with Catholicism, Naturalism, and Secularism, masterly descriptions and appraisals result. In almost every essay we are presented with a clarifying and informative analysis of the history and central ideas of the movement or viewpoint in question. This book should be of great help to those pastors and church leaders, and to those interested laymen, who wish to know more about the isms in and around our churches, and above all who feel the need of finding a balanced, intelligent Protestant judgment upon their merits and demerits. At this point of balance, fairness and unity of appraisal on all the various "ideologies" of our American life, this book is a remarkable achievement.

Inevitably a book which frankly looks at all other viewpoints from the position of "main line Protestantism" gives a somewhat erroneous impression of our religious and cultural life. A careless reader might conclude from this format that Judaism and Roman Catholicism were deviations from classical Protestantism, much as were the Mormons or the Nazarenes. Also a conventional Protestant might be misled into thinking that, because of his own "main line" allegiance, he is a member of an ideal central reality called normative Protestantism, which is happily both loyal to the Bible (though not fundamentalist) and yet related to culture (though not overwhelmed by it). This false impression of Protestant reality, the fine last chapter on secularism within Protestant churches should quickly dispel—but still better would have been a frank chapter on the problems, tensions, deviations and compromises of "main line Protestantism." And because the book rightly spends most of its energies dealing with religious "sects" and "isms," it gives the impression that religious ideas and issues are actually more dominant in our naturalistic and secular common life than they are—although this impression is more valid for the South than for the North.

A final critique is that nowhere does the book tackle adequately the problem of biblical literalism. As a product of a leading seminary in a "conservative" denomination, this book deals with the issue of fundamentalism in a remarkably enlightened way, and should do a great deal of good on that score. But it is perhaps misleading to treat literalism, and its parent, verbal inspiration, as characteristic only of "fundamentalist" groups, and not as one of the great isms within the church life, if not the theology, of contemporary main line Protestantism. One could wish, therefore, that the argument with literalism had been broached on the most fundamental level, namely, on the meaning of revelation, rather than treated as a part of a general argument with the "narrow" fundamentalists outside the main stream of Protestantism. For it is only by a discussion on that level that the majority of the people in the pews of the average Protestant church are going to be released from this dominant ism in our midst, and be free to view their Bibles as seminary professors do. However, this is an excellent and interesting book, and can be of great service to churches interested in the religious and secular culture of which they are a part.

LANGDON B. GILKEY

Professor of Theology, The Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville,
Tennessee.

The Conflict With Rome. By GERRIT C. BERKOUWER. Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1958. vii-319 pp. \$5.95.

One in Christ. By K. E. SKYDGAARD, transl. by Axel C. Kildegaard. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957. vii-220 pp. \$4.00.

These two books, though both by European Protestants and both dealing with the differences between Protestantism and Catholicism, differ widely.

The Conflict With Rome is a learned and objective study of the general doctrines of the Roman Church on the one hand and Reformation theology on the other. In his first chapter Berkouwer deals with the meaning of Catholic authority, the claim, "Thus says the Church" which for Rome equals the prophet's words, "Thus saith the Lord," and with the way the Reformation has rejected the absolute authority of the Church, the *causa finita est*. He quotes a message from Roman Catholics to Protestants which reads in part: "The Bible alone appears to offer an insufficient anchorage. Does not Protestantism see that the Bible grows in the vital sphere of the church?" He acknowledges that the Reformation undermined the Roman authority at its very roots; but at the same time the Reformation rediscovered the *ecclesia audiens*, the listening church, by "leaving the Bible open in the church, where it can be read, listened to and preached."

In his last chapter, "Existing Confusion and the Future," Berkouwer deals with today's problems. As he sees the present conflict, though the nuances have changed, the central questions which gave rise to the conflict in the sixteenth century still play a dominant role. The modernist view of the nineteenth century around which the conflict between Rome and the Reformation was centered has become unimportant and no longer plays a dominant role. Instead, the issues of the sixteenth century are once again in the center of the conflict. He refers to "the authority of the divine word, the church and its authority . . . and the sovereignty of divine grace."

It is surprising that throughout this book Berkouwer never mentions today's ecumenical attitude of both the churches of the Reformation and Roman Catholicism toward each other. When he speaks at great length of Karl Barth's theology, he does so exclusively from the point of view of Barth's conflict with Rome. The author does not even mention that there are today many prominent Roman Catholics, such as Hans Urs von Balthasar, who have understood Barth as well, if not better, than his fellow Protestants. The author believes that in Rome's view both Barth and the Reformers misjudged the relation between God and man. Though Berkouwer points out that Barth takes a much stronger position concerning natural theology than the Reformers did, he still believes as Barth does that the idea of natural theology is the most important issue in the conflict between Rome and the Reformation.

It is characteristic for K. E. Skydsgaard's book, *One in Christ*, that it carries the subtitle, "Protestants and Catholics, where they agree and where they differ." It is therefore not concerned primarily, as is Berkouwer's book, with the essential differences between Rome and the Reformation as seen in their principal doctrines. Though Skydsgaard in no way minimizes the differences between Rome and the Evangelical churches, he repeatedly emphasizes "the belief and the worshipful confession of Jesus Christ as the living Lord" which is shared by both of them. He hints at something which is occurring today in the mutual relationship of the two parties that perhaps opens a possibility of a meeting between them not seen since the time of the Reformation. In the case of "Roman Catholic and Evangelical Bible exegesis in our time" there often exists an "absolutely amazing agreement between the scholars."

One of the most enlightening chapters in Skydsgaard's book is "Scripture and Tradition." He starts with the description of the Roman point of view. In the Roman Catholic Church "the Bible can never be the only source of faith—let alone the rule of faith. It must always be understood and interpreted in accordance with the tradition." The Evangelical church on the other hand will not deny that "tradition arises and has its importance, but it is always secondary to scripture." For the Evangelical church feels that "it is decisive to distinguish between the apostolic times and all subsequent periods." But though there exists a real difference between these two points of view there is according to Skydsgaard something on which the two parties are agreed. "They are both confessional churches, churches that acknowledge Jesus as the Christ and Lord . . . whom the apostles confessed and concerning whom their creed and scripture bear witness." And though "the Evangelical view calls for a strong distinction between the foundation and the building, between the basis and that which follows, between being an apostle and not being an apostle," both the Roman Catholic and the Evangelical church will only acknowledge a tradition in which Christ is called Lord. And because there is this common basis a conversation between the churches is possible and not fruitless.

MARIA F. SULZBACH, Ph.D.

35 West Ninety-second Street, New York City.

The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America. By ROBERT D. CROSS.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. xi-328 pp. \$5.50.

An authoritative book, profusely documented with 67 pages of citations alone, 18 pages of bibliography and 14 more for the index. Indispensable for the student of the Roman Catholic (hereinafter the Catholic) Church in America or Europe. Written by a Protestant, a professor at Swarthmore College, it is extremely sympathetic with the Catholic Church as a whole. Famous men such as Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, Father Hecker (founder of the Paulists), and a host of less famous ones, crowd the pages. So interestingly is the story told, in spite of the great mass of material, that few who read through the first ten chapters could resist reading the last, to find how it all came out.

The book has nothing to do with the so-called Liberal Catholic Church, but rather with a movement within the Catholic Church in America, chiefly in the nineteenth century. The meaning of the word "liberal" is almost as relative as that of "above" or "below." If the complete position of those who are here styled liberals were set beside that of a typical American Protestant, or humanist, it would appear to be ultraconservative. But in comparison with the tendencies which it has had to fight, this Catholic party, or tendency, or movement, appears daringly progressive.

One thing is quite clear: "liberalism" among Catholics has nothing to do with liberalizing of doctrine, or any slackening of intransigent insistence on the Roman as the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. It has to do, rather, basically with the ancient question, in its American phase: Can the Church accept and co-operate with a non-Catholic culture, society and government, or must the Church live defensively, as a besieged city in a hostile land? Many features of modern Catholicism which Protestant observers are likely to take for granted are here shown to be related to this basic problem of the interrelation of the church and culture. Painfully, in the face of what to Protestant eyes is almost inexplicable opposition, there emerged such features as the now common Catholic ways of softening the proposi-

tion that outside the Church there is no salvation; the evangelistic zeal marking much Catholicism today; the extent to which that church has been modernized and Americanized; the appearance of Catholics at interfaith conferences; the efforts (not too successful) to enlist wider lay participation in the Church; the Church's interest in higher education; the spirit and activity of the Christophers ("You can change the world").

These things did not come to these shores with the Catholic immigrants, but sprang up on American soil, or more precisely, throve here better than elsewhere. That such tendencies exist at all is the result of many battles. Neither the liberal nor the conservative can be wholly satisfied (the author thinks) with the Catholic Church as it is. What we can say is that conservatism never has crushed liberalism, but neither has the Church outgrown its conservatism.

KENNETH J. FOREMAN

Professor of Doctrinal Theology, The Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky.

Jesus and His Coming. By JOHN A. T. ROBINSON. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958. 192 pp. \$4.00.

"The Church finds itself today in much the same position with regard to its doctrine of the Last Things as our grandfathers did a century ago in relation to the First Things," writes J. A. T. Robinson in the introduction to his recently published *William Belden Noble Lectures*, given at Harvard in 1955. Few will doubt that the eschatological teaching of the New Testament constitutes a crucial problem to the biblical scholar, to the ecumenical theologian, and to the conscientious pastor and his people.

This little book makes a significant contribution to one aspect of the discussion, the doctrine of the Second Coming of Christ. Robinson believes that the biblical evidence must be used critically and discriminately, for it is evident that Jesus' teaching about his "coming" has undergone a transformation in the light of the Church's own concern about a future glorious return of her Lord. In a careful exegetical analysis of the principal Synoptic sayings and parables referring to the coming of the Son of Man, the conclusion is reached that Jesus proclaimed his own vindication and visitation as Son of Man, not as separable events divided by an interval of time, but rather as the consummate eschatological crisis which would be precipitated by his rejection and death. For him and for the earliest preaching of the Church, the Resurrection, Exaltation, and Parousia were conceived as aspects of a single total event which would mark the judgment of God upon the sinful nation and upon Jesus as the vindicated Son of Man.

Robinson is further persuaded that in his earlier epistles Paul reflects the early Church's alterations of the sayings of Jesus under the dominance of its developing apocalyptic outlook, whereas his more mature thought reveals affinities with an inaugurated eschatology which has already been found in the earliest strands of the Synoptic tradition and which is most perfectly preserved in the Fourth Gospel.

To answer the question, Why did Christ come to be expected twice? is far more difficult. Robinson's proposals here are ingenious but debatable. He believes that the Church divided into two separate moments the pristine single event inaugurated by the death of Christ, and that this was the outcome of a compromise effected between its faith that he was designated Lord by virtue of his resurrection and a still

earlier Christology, reflected in Acts 3, which declared that the messianic event, though vouchsafed by the resurrection, was yet to be realized.

Several problems remain unanswered, however. If the original tradition was more faithful than the later to Jesus' own view of the consummation, how are we to account for this equally primitive Christology of Acts 3 which allegedly placed the Christophany in the future? Furthermore, while Jesus may have believed that the consummation of his ministry would occur immediately upon his rejection and death, is it certain that he distinguished his own victory from that ultimate regnancy of the divine purpose in the Day of the Lord (p. 87)? There was still a genuine future whose mystery was not yet fully declared, but with which he was concerned.

Robinson does succeed brilliantly in showing that in the earliest faith of the Church there was not the sharp disjunction which was made later between life in the Risen Christ and life in the Age to Come. The Church celebrated joyfully what had truly and finally begun in the Resurrection Age, but it looked also at the ultimate end as something more than the inevitable result of a process which would disclose nothing more than what was already given in the beginning (p. 169). And that is why the myth of the unfulfilled Parousia, as Robinson himself admits, is inescapable in a Christian understanding of history.

ERNEST W. SAUNDERS

Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul. By NEILL Q. HAMILTON. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, Ltd., 1957. vii-94 pp. 8/6.

This is a dissertation done as requirement for the degree of Doctor of Theology at the University of Basel by a student of Oscar Cullmann. The thesis is twofold: (1) Paul's doctrine of the Spirit is Christocentric; (2) the Spirit is primarily an eschatological entity.

The thesis is defended against three notable men in the field: Schweitzer, Dodd, and Bultmann. Hamilton finds that if he must choose between Schweitzer and Dodd, his preference is for the former. Yet Schweitzer holds to two resurrections and two "blessednesses," a temporal and an eternal. Besides, Schweitzer has a "fuzziness of Christology," making Christ the Son of God, but not God, only a heavenly Being; while Hamilton contends that the Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus, Jesus is Lord, "and that makes Him precisely God."

The thesis must oppose Dodd's "inaccuracies in realized eschatology" and his idea that Paul shifted from belief in a "speedy" to an "imminent" return. Hamilton believes that Paul held from first to last "futuristic and apocalyptic elements as an integral part of his theology." The quarrel with Bultmann is that he reduces time, the eschatological age, and the Spirit to merely subjective experiences. "The Spirit does not have a *relation* to the future. The Spirit is *replaced* by the future."

As to the soundness of Hamilton's twofold thesis, few will question the first part of it. However we may interpret "the Lord is the Spirit," Paul sees a dependence which does not quite fit into the clear-cut distinctions of Trinitarian theology. The difficulty comes in the second half of the thesis. The uncertain term is "primarily." Hamilton's agreement with Dodd recognizes the benefits of redemption which are available now. One could hardly overlook Paul's conception of the present work of the Spirit, nor think of the "fruit of the Spirit" as a harvest that

must wait altogether for future ingathering. To say that "the Spirit of the future has been released into the present" is one way of putting it, but it is not certain that it is Paul's way.

MONTGOMERY J. SHROYER

Professor of New Testament, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D. C.

Jesus Compared. A Study of Jesus and Other Great Founders of Religion.

By CHARLES S. BRADEN. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1957. ix-230 pp. \$5.35.

At a time when sympathetic knowledge of the religious traditions of the vast majority of the world's people is becoming increasingly imperative, there are too few writers with the compassion, knowledge, and facility of expression of Professor Braden. This volume deserves to be widely used throughout the churches as a study book for both youth and adult groups.

The author, an ordained minister standing within the liberal tradition of Protestant Christianity, expresses his own convictions without raising his voice at any point and at the same time is remarkably fair and sympathetic in dealing with all the figures he compares with Jesus. His attitude is expressed quite simply in the statement that "the Christian faith may safely be trusted to stand up alongside any others without any attempt on my part to misrepresent or to belittle them" (p. vii). Speaking of Moslems he has known, he says, "Were it not better to recognize in them fellow-seekers after truth, and through fellowship with them in all possible ways, without sacrificing any deep Christian conviction, seek to lead them into a fuller acceptance of Him whom Christians in different ways believe to have been the complete revelation of God to man?" (p. 220).

In addition to an opening chapter on Jesus, there are separate chapters in which Jesus is compared with the Buddha, Krishna, Mahavira, Nanak, Confucius, Lao-tzu, Zoroaster, Moses, and Mohammed. In each case the author follows a plan of first looking at the sources of our knowledge of the figure involved, then going on to bring out the similarities between the individuals. After that, he discusses the differences and then treats of the ways in which their followers, both earlier and later, came to think of them. Where the individuals concerned are possibly only legendary (as in the cases of Krishna and Lao-tzu), he quotes authorities who regard them as historical, but concentrates his attention on the ideas as developed by the followers.

Few readers of this volume will have the background that Dr. Braden brought to the writing of this book, but having read it thoughtfully they will be better able to meet their fellow men of other faiths. Respecting the diversity of the children of men, they may discover something more of the peace and love of God. Dr. Braden deserves our thanks for this timely volume.

FLOYD H. ROSS

Professor of World Religions, Southern California School of Theology, Claremont, California.

More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. By MILLAR BURROWS. New York: The Viking Press, 1958. xiii-434 pp. \$6.50.

The Ancient Library of Qumrân and Modern Biblical Studies. By FRANK MOORE CROSS, JR. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1958. 196 pp. \$4.50.

These two authoritative books on the Scrolls have brought the large and intensely interested reading public up-to-date on discoveries of new scrolls and on recent re-

search. While both scholars agree that further materials from the Qumrân Caves and the extensive discussion of the importance of the Scrolls have checked foolish and wild, if not irresponsible, conclusions regarding their significance, Dr. Burrows is inclined to maintain that the "more light" confirms his previous statements and Dr. Cross suggests that "Qumrân studies are ready to enter into a new phase."

Even though the market has been flooded by a multitude of books whose authors have frequently rehearsed the Scroll story in similar words, each of these books has made its own unique contribution and does not duplicate the other. By including a translation of new texts, by summarizing and evaluating scholarly research, and by expanding the discussion of Christian origins in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Part II), Dr. Burrows' book aids both the layman and the specialist in the field. In this second book, however, the layman will probably be overwhelmed by the intricacies of debated issues. A contribution which should not be overlooked in Dr. Burrows' book is the index for both of his works on the Scrolls.

Since Dr. Cross' book is not the sequel of an earlier work on the Scrolls but the result of lectures delivered to the Graduate School of Theology of Oberlin College, his discussion of the Qumrân library and modern biblical studies serves a different purpose than does Dr. Burrows' work. Dr. Cross has not attempted to give a "comprehensive treatment of the field of scroll study as a whole" but to achieve in given areas "a synthesis or at least a systematic interpretation of the facts now available." His close association with the international group of scholars working in Jerusalem on the continuous and laborious task of piecing together fragments of scrolls provides him with information available only to this research team.

While different purposes determine the treatment given in these two books to the study of the Scrolls, Dr. Burrows and Dr. Cross deal with many of the same central issues: the character and identification of the sect, their beliefs, rites and organization, the significance of the Old Testament manuscripts discovered for the study of the text of the Old Testament, and the possible impact of the Sect upon early Christian origins. Both authors associate the Qumrân Sect with the Essenes, but Dr. Burrows insistently cautions the reader against the current tendency to identify the Qumrân Sect with the Essenes mentioned by Josephus and Philo. In his discussion of the Teacher of Righteousness, Dr. Burrows is primarily concerned with arguments against the identification of this sectarian leader with any of the Messianic figures spoken of in the Qumrân texts. Dr. Cross, on the other hand, stresses the priestly character of the Righteous Teacher and his role in conflicting claims for priestly authority.

On the question of the importance of the recovery of ancient biblical documents for textual criticism, both scholars agree that the textual scholar's chief interest lies not merely in their antiquity but in the data they yield for the reconstruction of the textual history of the Old Testament. These two authors note both the value in the variety of divergent traditions of Old Testament texts found at Qumrân and the consequent problems raised regarding the possible reflection of distinct recensions.

Since the most controversial issue concerns possible sectarian influences upon early Christian origins, Dr. Burrows and Dr. Cross both deal with this problem. In a series of brief chapters on John the Baptist, the person and saving work of Jesus Christ, the life and character of Jesus, the teachings of Jesus, the apostolic church, Paul, John and the rest of the New Testament, Dr. Burrows concludes quite correctly that "contacts between Jesus' teaching and the ideas of the Qumrân Sect about things to come . . . are not so close as to indicate any direct connections"; nor has the "originality of Jesus as a religious teacher been impaired." He also states that the

similarities between the New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls has been greatly exaggerated.

If one examines the problem by listing parallels in theological language, cultic procedures and ethos, one would arrive at this conclusion. It seems, therefore, that Dr. Cross, although he makes no pretense of treating the subject exhaustively, suggests a more adequate procedure; that is, an examination of these parallels "which appear to belong to a related apocalyptic framework." While the procedure is sound, this reviewer questions the adequacy of the framework. Should not the vantage point for viewing trends within Judaism be such that one can attempt to examine developments within a framework which encompasses the great variety of religious thought and life within Judaism? Thus it would be possible to ascertain with greater certainty the degree of influence exerted by the Qumrân Sect upon the Church. This larger outlook could be that of "redemption."

LUCETTA MOWRY

Associate Professor of Biblical History, Literature and Interpretation, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? By OSCAR CULLMANN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958. 60 pp. \$1.25.

The Meaning of Immortality in Human Experience. By WILLIAM E. HOCKING. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. xviii-263 pp. \$3.50.

If a man die—then what? To the disturbing question posed by the common experience of death each religion and most cultures have characteristic answers. Death continues to take its toll, but cultures and religions change. And men's viewpoints and convictions change. Living today there are undoubtedly more persons who have encountered death in family bereavement than at any time in the past. And probably there has never been a time when so many persons either deny the possibility of *post mortem* survival or simply shrug it off as an unanswerable riddle. What can be said to men of such persuasions?

Professors Hocking and Cullmann, distinguished philosopher and biblical scholar, respectively, have conviction and concepts about survival which they want to assert. Both speak as Christians. But the contents of their books seem barely related. Of course, the philosophical method differs from that of exegesis of the Bible. And yet there is so radical a contrast between these books that their chief point in common seems to be that they both comprise Ingersoll Lectures on the Immortality of Man delivered at Harvard, nearly twenty years apart.

The relevance of Cullmann's lectures for much of contemporary Protestantism is perfectly clear. The indispensable, foundational Christian faith in the resurrection of the dead has been widely abandoned. In its place is the ancient Greek notion of the immortality of the soul. A sampling of recent Easter sermons would substantiate his indictment. A minister in a high position expressed amazement not long ago when I suggested, as Cullmann shows, that immortality and resurrection are neither interchangeable nor complementary concepts, but essentially irreconcilable. While this suggestion may seem both offensive and contestable to many Christians today, it cannot be contested, says Cullmann, on exegetical grounds.

The classic exposition of the belief in the immortality of the soul is in Plato's *Phaedo*, where Socrates' meditations on death are recorded. Cullmann underscores the total dissimilarity between the attitudes of Socrates and Jesus Christ in the face

of death. The former chats amiably with his young friends, speculates on the future of the soul, and then takes a final bath so that "the women may not have the trouble of washing my body after I am dead." But death for Jesus is a dreaded thing. He struggles in Gethsemane against the prospect of it, implores his disciples not to sleep and leave him alone, and finally on the cross utters a loud scream of agony before the end comes. Jesus knew that death was not the emancipation of an immortal soul from the earthly prison of flesh. Rather, death threatens to end both soul and body, and so it rightly is regarded as the "last enemy" to be overcome by God.

More important still, the resurrection of Jesus Christ would have been a useless, empty event if the soul were inherently destined for eternal blessedness. Cullmann emphasizes the conviction of the early Christians, particularly of New Testament times, that Christ's resurrection was the cornerstone of faith, the cause of hope in this life and the promise of their own resurrection in a "spiritual body" at the consummation of the Kingdom. This conviction, declares Cullmann, was no mere dalliance with an attractive myth. And its place in Christian faith today is no less central than it was then.

Professor Hocking does not merely repeat the Greek notion of immortality, but his procession of thought is much in line with it. He finds the condition of the human self to be, "not immortality, but immortability, the conditional possibility of survival" (p. 74). This conception is based neither upon mystical vision, nor upon an eternal moral imperative (as with Kant and Royce), nor yet upon the Christian witness to Jesus Christ (to whose resurrection Hocking never even alludes in the whole book!). The possibility of personal survival, rather, is just a necessity if life is to have any meaning whatsoever. And the final appeal for assurance of immortality is to what Whitehead described as "the reaction of our own nature to the general aspect of life in the Universe," which is to say, to the common intuition of mankind (p. 194). Adding strength to this hope is the experience of man's freedom of decision, an experience which spells the invalidation and destruction of any philosophy of physical monism wherein the idea of immortality could have no place.

Despite their common problem, these two books contain scarcely enough common elements to make critical comparison possible. Hocking's work is certainly a more formidable intellectual achievement than Cullmann's, and his literary gracefulness makes the book more pleasant to read. But the greater cogency of argument for personal survival through resurrection of the whole person by God's power is, to this reader, the merit of Cullmann's lectures. Neither book, however, quite fills the need we feel in America for a major study on the Christian conception of death and life eternal (comparable, for example, to Helmut Thielicke's *Tod und Leben*, 1946). Perhaps the very brevity of Cullmann's book and the theological insufficiency of Hocking's will prompt some competent writer to meet this need.

J. ROBERT NELSON

Dean and Professor of Theology, Vanderbilt Divinity School, Nashville, Tennessee.

Nothing So Strange: The Autobiography of Arthur Ford. (In collaboration with Margaritte Harmon Bro.) New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. 250 pp. \$3.75.

This book has already been the subject of vigorous attack. One recent editorial review "foams at the mouth" theologically as it discusses the author's views. Since

the matters with which it deals have to do with extrasensory perception, precognition, clairvoyance, clairaudience and other phenomena now under investigation by paranormal psychology and more or less familiar to the reading public, one is surprised at the violence with which the book is denounced. But the reason soon appears. It is not because the book presents the story of one acknowledged to be "one of the world's best known, most consulted mediums," but because of its "suggested world view."

With parts of that world view, this reviewer must also disagree, but not with all of it. As long as the author relates and describes his own uncanny experiences in contact with events and people not visibly or audibly present, he is interesting and impressive. He is evidently a gifted "sensitive," and what he reports is worthy of the attention of all who are concerned with the reaches of the human mind beyond the borders of sense experience. Happily, psychologists, like Rhine at Duke University and others of equal scientific integrity, are exploring this field. Their findings have great significance for us all. Light is thrown upon our interpersonal relationships in everyday life and upon the whole adventure of prayer. Evidently the human consciousness is not as sense-limited as philosophers once assumed. The dictum upon which many of us were reared was the assurance that "there is nothing in consciousness which is not first in the senses." Now we are assured that consciousness is open to much that does not come through sense media, that we live in a psychic context which includes not only human mentalities but the reality of God. Intercessory prayer and the mystic's quest for a direct awareness of God are accredited in a new way as rational activities and not the favorite phantoms of the credulous.

But the author's attempts to interpret his experiences are rightly under question. He is neither psychologist nor theologian and inevitably his conclusions are challenged by experts in both realms. The self cannot be explained in terms of energy and vibrations. Nor can its strange outreach into other selves or its amazing contacts with events past, present and future be described as the intersection of fields of force.

But while one may rightly dismiss such materialism, one may not so justifiably pooh-pooh the evidences of communication with the departed. The caustic review to which reference was made at the beginning seems to this reviewer to be inexcusable. It is infected with theological assumptions for which some of us have as little tolerance as the critic has for the idea that we may have word from those who have "outsoared the darkness of our night." To say, as does the critic, that "there is no footing for any idea that the body or mind can ever be separated," or that "the intellection that transcends matter does not outlast the material it transcends," or that "whole men . . . die entire" seems to one man, Cullmann and Gill to the contrary notwithstanding, to be unbiblical materialism that is worse than the theory which is attributed to Arthur Ford! Nor is it wholly redeemed by the admission that "something has not died apparently. Something lives on." That scant trace of the surviving self, however, which is asserted by the critic to be "only the earnest of the whole man" which "spans the time between death and the resurrection, waits. It sleeps."

On the contrary, Jesus said to the dying thief, "this day shalt thou be with me in paradise," and Paul wrote confidently, "to be absent from the body" is "to be present with the Lord." One needs not be the victim of a delusion about "the immortality of the soul" to believe the word of Jesus, "he who lives and believes in me shall never die." "Detached minds, immortal souls, discarnates wandering and thinking and talking" may "have no place in the biblical picture" but neither is there a place for the attenuated survival that must wait a distant resurrection. Nor, if the

resurrection is conceived as something that immediately follows the "death entire," does it necessarily follow that the resurrected are so far removed from earthly scenes and from their beloved, that communication is absolutely precluded.

It has been the good fortune of this reviewer to be associated in the work of the church with two choice sensitives. He must report that in their company he has been confronted with experiences which have challenged his skepticism and for which no other interpretation seems possible save that of communication for a high and holy purpose, from those whom he has loved and lost a while.

At any rate there is much in this book that is of great value. The story of Arthur Ford's personal regeneration is illuminating and his observations on high prayer are worth the price of the book itself.

ALBERT EDWARD DAY

Chaplain and Director of Spiritual Life, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D. C.

Nurslings of Immortality. By RAYNOR C. JOHNSON. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. 279 pp. \$5.00.

Every educated person attempts to interpret the world in which he lives according to the insights given him by his specialized training and the culture in which he moves. The author, a Doctor of Science and Master of Queen's College, University of Melbourne, is thus entitled to our respectful attention as he unfolds his thoughts. But respect does not imply agreement with the conclusions reached, and this reviewer questions the extent to which so-called science is used to buttress the theology presented as well as that theology itself. All of which does not mean that the book is not provocative and interesting, but it must be read critically and with discrimination.

Dr. Johnson has been drawn to the philosophy of Douglas Fawcett, and it is this philosophy, named imaginism, which is first presented to the reader of this book. "Imagining is the psychical spring within the mind from which all other faculties derive," says the author, and again, "The activity of Ultimate Reality, the Supreme Power, resembles most closely the human experience which we call imagining." The philosophy of imaginism is the basis of the author's theology, and he next proposes to give it authority by scientific evidence.

The nature of his subject requires him to turn to psychical research for support, and there is no more disputed area into which he could venture. Some scientists would throw his whole case out of court on the evidence which he presents; but even those who are sympathetic to the conclusions of some workers in this field would gag at accepting such statements as: "The evidence for [telepathy] is overwhelming." ". . . the evidence for [clairvoyance] is overwhelming and the phenomenon is completely established." "The mind has a faculty of acquiring knowledge of future events," "[Poltergeist effects] are remarkably well attested, and there can, I think, be no doubt of their existence." Dr. Johnson also does not doubt the existence of ectoplasm, hauntings, levitation, and similar manifestations normally associated with spiritualism.

All of this, he claims, is evidence of immortality, and the final chapters of the book are devoted to the nature of the next life. It seems there are seven planes of existence with such descriptive names as the plane of illusion, the plane of color, the plane of flame, the plane of white light, etc. These are conceived as being different levels of consciousness or "worlds whose inhabitants enjoy widening and increasing

intensity of consiring." Now orthodoxy for the sake of orthodoxy is valueless, and perhaps a new and refreshing heresy is useful from time to time to keep us on our toes; but Christianity vanquished this sort of Gnosticism early in its career, and there is no good reason to accept it today under another guise.

If one is truly concerned with an immortality that has meaning (better called eternal life), he will find the promise of it more convincingly presented in any of the Gospel accounts of the first Easter than he will in this book.

RICHARD K. TONER

Associate Professor of Chemical Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Melanchthon: The Quiet Reformer. By CLYDE MANSCHRECK. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958. 350 pp. \$6.00.

Both author and publisher are to be complimented on the appearance of this handsome, long awaited, and much needed biography of Philip Melanchthon, one of several first-rate Reformers who have suffered over the years from proximity to the "big three." This is especially true of Melanchthon, who not only stood under the shadow of Luther but also bore the charge of distorting Lutheran theology and falling into heresy.

Although study of Melanchthon has by no means been completely neglected (Schottenloher's list runs over several pages), full biographical studies have been few. In German the lives by C. Schmidt (1861) and G. Ellinger (1902), the exhaustive essay on Melanchthon as educator by V. Hartfelder (1889), and the recent compact comparison of Luther and Melanchthon by Leo Stern (1953), are noteworthy. In English the only good biographical study has been that by J. W. Richard (1898). It is high time that he should be rescued from (1) obscurity, (2) misunderstanding.

Manschreck has performed nobly in his task of redefinition. Using heavily the bulky collection of Melanchthonia in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, he has told an interesting life story and has placed his subject firmly in the center of the theological upheaval of the Reformation and the educational revolution of the Renaissance. Thence comes the remarkable fact that the nephew of Reuchlin and the friend of Erasmus became the right-hand man of Luther!

From the time the scrawny young man joined the faculty at Wittenberg down through the long years after Luther's death to that of his own in 1560, he was an influential figure clearly distinguishable from that of the great Wittenberger. His early *Loci Communnes* will stand for all as a classic systematic presentation of Christian theology. The Augsburg Confession, of which he was author, and his *Apology*, or defense of it, have mellowed over the years and survived many bitter conflicts in which his reputation was at stake. Manschreck defends his integrity in the midst of controversy, seeing adaptability and maturity where others have seen inconsistency and even connivance with the Romans.

The text is enhanced by some well selected contemporary illustrations, chiefly woodcuts, an excellent apparatus of notes, and a satisfactory index—but no bibliography apart from the notes. If the author sounds at times too intent on rehabilitating his hero, he may be pardoned, because he has remained moderate and because the service is long past due.

The Quiet Reformer is a substantial contribution to the understanding of the

man who for too long has played moon to Luther's sun. He deserves to shine with his own light, which bears in the last analysis a clear measure of celestial radiance.

FREDERICK A. NORWOOD

Professor of History of Christianity, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois.

Calvin's Doctrine of Man. By T. F. TORRANCE. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1957. 183 pp. \$3.00.

On the Christian Faith. By JOHN CALVIN, edited by JOHN T. MCNEILL. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1957. xxxiv-219 pp. (pap.). \$.95.

Karl Barth praises this first work, calling it, in *Church Dogmatics*, IV/1, "a fine book." With this judgment we must certainly agree, and for two reasons. In the first place it is a good piece of historical theology, and gives a true representation of Calvin's doctrine of man. It is also a genuine attempt to grapple with his thought as living theology. Historical theology can all too easily become museum theology. One of the reasons why Calvin is, or has been, so unpopular, is because exponents of his theology have so systematized him that they have deprived him of all life, of all contact with living thought. When he is treated in the way Torrance treats him here, his thought becomes, *mutatis mutandis*, a living issue for our own age, raising questions which might otherwise have been neglected, correcting many modern lines of thought, suggesting fresh approaches.

Moreover, this is not what we might call "research theology"—i.e., a subject taken up incidentally and for the sake of writing a book on it. On the contrary, it grew out of a long and patient study of Calvin when Torrance was a country minister in Scotland and was faced with the task of expounding the Bible to his people. No one could accuse Torrance of being an uncritical Calvinist, but he has, to adapt some words of William Watson, taken Calvin's thought into his brain and blood. Hence, when he comes to write on Calvin, he not only knows what he is writing about, but by having lived with it and sifted and assimilated it, can make it into contemporary theology.

In this book he keeps to Calvin himself and does not refer (at least openly) to works on the Reformer or to other sixteenth-century theologians. From Calvin he draws a mass of quotations—indeed, he seems to think that all he is doing is to "present Calvin's thought in his own way and in his own words" (p. 7). This, however, is not the case. It is true that Torrance's method is to string together several illustrative quotations, often in a manner reminiscent of Heppe's *Reformed Dogmatics*. But by his own comments and by the order in which he arranges the quotations he gives a very decided interpretation. This is not at all a simple presentation, but a highly sophisticated representation. As such it is theological thinking of a high order.

Our second book consists of selections from the Institutes, commentaries and tracts of Calvin. The selection has been well made, and should serve as a serviceable introduction to Calvin's writings. The caveat ought to be entered that the Calvin Translation Society commentaries, from which these selections are taken, do not always provide an accurate translation and need to be checked. But that apart, the beginner in Calvin will find here a broad cross-section of Calvin's theology.

T. H. L. PARKER

Rector of Great and Little Ponton, Lincolnshire, England.

Theological Essays. By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE. New Edition with introduction by E. F. Carpenter. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. 331 pp. \$5.00.

It is good to know that the revival of interest in the thought of Frederick Denison Maurice, the great master-mind of nineteenth-century Anglican theology, has at last led to the republication of his works. Here is the first of them, now out in a nicely printed, easily read edition, with a careful introduction by Canon Carpenter of Westminster which sets Maurice in his proper context and summarizes his views in a few fine pages. Shortly further volumes will make their appearance; and the modern reader will no longer be obliged to resort to old, faded, disintegrating copies of the works in order to acquaint himself with Maurice's teaching.

Much might be written about the man and about this book. But for our present purposes it must suffice to say that Maurice wrote this work as an explanation to Unitarians (he had himself been one) of why he had entered the Church of England and why he had accepted the essential position of historical Christianity in respect to the person of Christ, the trinitarian nature of God, and the necessity for the Church. The last essay in the present volume, on "Eternal Life and Eternal Death," seemed, as Canon Carpenter rather mildly phrases it, "to cast doubt on, or at least not to affirm, the doctrine of eternal punishment." It was this essay which led to Maurice's dismissal from the professorship of theology at King's College, London—a sad fate for one who had entered the Anglican Church because of its "broader" views and who had regarded Unitarianism as narrowly dogmatic in a peculiarly rationalistic sort of way.

But Maurice continued in the Church and went in 1886 to Cambridge to become Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University. He neither forsook his convictions nor gave up the ministry, but was all the more inspired, although sometimes in despair at the growing party spirit in the Church of England, to work for and defend the main positions he held.

The modern reader will probably not bother much about the controversy; rather will he be interested in the massive insistence by Maurice on the living God and his ceaseless activity in the world; on the lordship of Christ as "head of the race"; on the significance of the Christian evaluation of Christ as the incarnation of the Word who "lightens every man"; on the distinction Maurice always made between the affirmation of God and his acts, on the one hand, and the doctrinal speculations about them by theologians, on the other. For these purposes *Theological Essays* will serve as the best introduction to the thought of the man, for much if not all of his developed teaching (as found, for example, in *The Kingdom of Christ*) is summarized in this relatively short and eminently readable work.

W. NORMAN PITTINGER

Professor of Christian Apologetics, General Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Book of the Acts of God: Christian Scholarship Interprets the Bible.

By G. ERNEST WRIGHT and REGINALD H. FULLER. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1957. 372 pp. \$4.95.

This is a volume in the "Christian Faith Series," of which Reinhold Niebuhr is consulting editor, and is designed to introduce the Bible to laymen. While it does contain some material on literary introduction, text, canon and the like, the emphasis

is placed on "the movement of biblical theology, the thoughts of believing men who sought to understand the ways of God and to proclaim those ways to their fellow men."

G. Ernest Wright, now of Harvard, writes the Prologue and the chapters on the Old Testament. Reginald H. Fuller, of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, writes the section, "Between the Old and New Testaments," and the chapters on the New Testament.

The authors' point of view is expressed in the title and in the introductory chapters on "The Biblical Point of View" and "The Knowledge of God." The rootage of biblical faith is found in five events of the Old Testament, and three in the New, an "event" being defined as a fact or happening that is interpreted so as to have revelatory meaning. The events of the Old Testament are: the call of the patriarchs, the deliverance from slavery in Egypt, the covenant at Sinai, the conquest of Canaan, and the Davidic conquests and government. The events of the New Testament are: the life and teaching of Jesus, his death on the cross, and his resurrection as head of a new community. It is clearly recognized that the last event is different from the others, in that it is a "faith-event." The biblical point of view, the authors say, was "to take history and historical tradition seriously and through them to foresee a future" (p. 25).

The chapter on the knowledge of God stresses the biblical emphasis on knowing God in his mighty acts in history, and in obedient response to his ethical demands. Wright denies—or almost denies—that, according to the biblical faith, God can be known through nature or through mystical experience.

The authors present a very important side of biblical religion, but have a restricted view that does less than justice to its many-sided richness. For example, why should we not add to the "events" of Israelite faith so important an occurrence as the exile (and its interpretation by II Isaiah), and to the New Testament the "event" of Paul's conversion and message? Was it not really the *whole* history of Israel that was the revelatory event? Biblical faith does not *emphasize* the revelation of God in nature, but it is found there—e.g., in the Psalms, such as 8, 19, 29, 104, etc. Also, it may be agreed that there is no thoroughgoing mystical experience in the Bible which involves absorption of the human in the divine; nevertheless there are many instances of genuine revelation to individuals through inner spiritual experience. It is significant that Wright seems to have little appreciation for the devotional and wisdom literature of the Old Testament, devoting to it only twenty pages, whereas the historical books get eighty-seven pages. He seems to say that the purpose of the wisdom books is to show the inadequacy of human wisdom to know God. Much more than that could be said.

This criticism must not be taken to imply lack of appreciation for the Old Testament section. Wright has a very incisive and important passage on the covenant, pp. 88-98. He makes excellent use of archeological discoveries, including those of Qumrân (as also does Fuller). He presents his point of view with clarity.

Fuller writes the section on religion and literature between the Testaments. He discusses briefly various religious movements, and introduces the reader to books such as I, II Maccabees, The Wisdom of Solomon, The Testament [*sic*] of the Twelve Patriarchs, I Enoch, etc.

Fuller believes that Christianity began as a proclamation. He quotes with approval A. M. Hunter's statement, "In the beginning was the kerygma." The gospels are thus completely kerygmatic in character. We cannot write a connected life of

Jesus, and we "know next to nothing of Jesus' inner life" (p. 252). Yet, Fuller reaches the conclusion that Jesus thought of himself as "Son of man designate." All other Messianic titles were ascribed to him by the early Christian community.

Paul was the first theologian, "the first significant thinker of the early Church." Fuller finds the key to Paul's theology in the concept of "redemptive history." His exposition of Paul is very illuminating, recognizing as it does the creativeness but the lack of system in Paul's thought. Fuller's work throughout shows the influence of Bultmann, one of whose books he translated.

One cannot indicate the full wealth of this book in a brief review. The layman who reads it will get a good introduction to the Bible—good, even if one-sided in some respects. He is likely, however, to be perplexed at many points by the vocabulary and the skepticism of present-day biblical scholarship.

J. PHILIP HYATT

Professor of Old Testament, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Hebrew Iliad: The History of the Rise of Israel Under Saul and David. Translated from the original Hebrew by ROBERT H. PFEIFFER, with introductions by WILLIAM G. POLLARD. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957. 154 pp. \$2.50.

William G. Pollard is the Executive Director of the Institute of Nuclear Studies at Oak Ridge. A recently ordained Episcopal clergyman, he became acquainted with the early source in Samuel during his biblical studies as he was preparing for Holy Orders. Appreciating the value of having these early materials in I and II Samuel in convenient form to be read by themselves, he had prepared a manuscript using a "standard version" (apparently KJV), but he has wisely changed to one in more modern dress, an excellent rendering by Robert H. Pfeiffer.

The text selected is that ascribed to this source by Pfeiffer in his well-known *Introduction to the Old Testament*, beginning with materials from the Book of Judges, i.e., chaps. 17-21. The translated text is divided into seventeen chapters, each with a brief introduction. There are two appendices, one a translation of narratives in the Book of Judges, and the other, selections from the late source in Samuel, using the KJV. The subtitle states that the early narrative was "written during the reign of Solomon, probably by the priest Ahimaaz."

Whether the early source in Samuel was composed by Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok, or by Nathan, or by Abiathar, or by one or more unrecorded authors is uncertain; but that the materials are early and a masterpiece of historical writing will not be denied. But this is not "the earliest example of a major written epic we possess" (cf. the Sumero-Akkadian Epic of Gilgamesh, the Ugaritic Epic of Keret, the Egyptian stories of Sinuhe and of the Shipwrecked Sailor, etc.). As Cyrus Gordon has recently pointed out, there was an East Mediterranean epic tradition, with roots deep in the second millennium, and underlying Homer and the Bible ("Homer and the Bible," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXVI, 1955, 43-108).

In the Introduction Pollard presents a brief reconstruction of the earlier history of Israel. He finds Israel's origins in a small band of wild Bedouin nomads in Midian who there had a terrifying experience during the eruption of a volcano, and who came to know Yahweh as the God of the storm and volcano. This is very dubious, and the problems are more complex than can be suggested in such brief scope. Pollard presents a form of the so-called "division hypothesis" of the entrance

of the Hebrews into Canaan ca. 1400 B.C. and in the thirteenth century. His reconstruction of the religious backgrounds follows that in *Early Traditions of Israel*, by C. A. Simpson, and his interpretation of the ark is taken from W. R. Arnold, *Ephod and Ark*. Pollard writes easily and clearly, and for the general reader, who will find reading "the early source in Samuel" a profitable and a pleasant experience.

HERBERT G. MAY

Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio.

Ed. Note: A group of reviews of recent works in the Old Testament field will appear in the Spring issue.

Light the Dark Streets. By C. KILMER MYERS. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1958. 156 pp. \$4.00.

"Don't you think a boy should have enough responsibility toward a girl to use a contraceptive when engaging in a sexual act?"

With this question Father Myers, Vicar of St. Augustine's Mission Church, opened one of his weekly discussions with the Knights, a teen-age gang on New York's Lower East Side. Father Myers knew that the sexual practices of the Knights and the Church's teaching on this subject were so far apart that a discussion based on Christian ethics would have been almost meaningless to them.

This gift for taking the boys where they are, and then moving with them to other levels, is characteristic of Father Myers' apostolate to the gangs. In these pages we are with him as he struggles to avert an all-out gang war (but not alone; he works closely with settlement house staffs and police and Youth Board workers). We are with him as he has a long uninterrupted talk with Ralph, who tells him: "A lot hangs together, like gangs, the East Side, drinking, pot (marijuana). You'd have to clean up the whole mess. Guys fourteen years old get high. They live their whole lives too soon."

On the wall of the Vicarage hangs the sign, "Let every guest be received as Christ." The bewildered, the frightened, the parolee, the narcotics addict—all find acceptance here. Yet putting out the welcome mat in church or vicarage is only one step toward solving the complex problem of the conflict street gang and of the youth adrift. How to have enough love to be able to give as fully and strenuously as the need demands? How learn what lies behind hate and negativism? (Father Myers has a deep appreciation of the unconscious factors in human behavior and makes a powerful plea for psychiatric training as a part of theological education.) How get the gangs to make a "no-rumbling" agreement? (No agreement would last, says Pablo, "unless we got to know each other in the heart.") How show the Knights they have a Savior? ("They didn't dig why Christ felt He had to take the rap for them or for anybody else.") How develop group leadership among the teen-agers? How find effective lay leadership—not dependent on "imported" middle-class families, but from among the masses of the people?

The author goes far beyond a description of a fascinating and challenging inner-city pastorate. He calls for new definitions, new depths, new meanings—of church, of parish, of sacraments, of crisis, of love. Though it is the love of Christ which lights the dark streets, the title may also be read in the imperative, as a command. If we try to follow it, and if we could achieve some of Father Myers'

dedication and insight, we might help the Church get down into the life of the community and escape the danger of remaining "a Society of Those Pleased with Themselves."

RICHARD V. McCANN

Associate Professor of Christian Sociology, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Massachusetts.

Christ and Celebrity Gods. By MALCOLM BOYD. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1958. xii-145 pp. \$3.50.

Within the last three years Malcolm Boyd, former Hollywood producer and writer and now an Episcopal priest, has emerged as one of America's most knowledgeable and articulate interpreters of Christian communication through mass media. In his latest work he seeks to examine the celebrity cult, "outside and inside the church, and . . . to see clearly how we are, in effect, being evangelized by our culture and the wisdom of the world." Mr. Boyd is as much concerned with the theme of "the world in the church" as with "the church in the world." Thus the church is too much enmeshed in adulation of the celebrity gods. The author comments about church TV and radio shows, "Jesus Christ is presumably . . . to be presented *through* the celebrity." The resulting strategy of evangelism suffers from a preoccupation with conspicuous success, with a self-conscious witnessing that points more to the celebrity status of the evangelist than to the grace of God. Yet this little book is not simply another stricture against mass evangelism. Mr. Boyd illustrates the church's immersion in the "celebrity cult" by a convincing study of the clergy's eager participation in the massive buildup for Hollywood's latest "Bible" spectacular, *The Ten Commandments*—or, as he deftly entitles it, *Mr. DeMille's Commandments*.

Mr. Boyd is less successful in his treatment of the subordinate theme of the book: the need for a Christian interpretation of the content of the mass media. His curious assortment of reviews and comments on recent movies and plays indicates just how difficult it is to establish a specifically Christian perspective upon the offerings of TV, the movies, etc.

But the real thrust of the book is toward a new and powerfully honest understanding of Christian evangelism. In some future work, Mr. Boyd should extend and develop his penetrating remarks about a full Christian witness contained in the closing pages of this book.

ROBERT W. LYNN

Mountview Presbyterian Church, Denver, Colorado.

Prayer That Prevails. By G. RAY JORDAN. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958. x-157 pp. \$3.00.

The reviewer's impression when he first picked up this book was "Just another book about prayer"—and that despite the fact that he knew the author to be a first-class writer on "the things of the spirit." But he had not read very far before exclaiming, "This is *not* just another book about prayer!" It is obvious that Dr. Jordan is a "master of the spiritual life" and that he has in this volume (as in his previous books) put his great gifts as a religious writer to the best possible use.

Compared with George Buttrick's massive volume on this subject, *Prayer That Prevails* is a slender book, yet it is worthy to be placed side by side with Buttrick.

Its purpose is eminently practical. It does not merely insist that "men ought always to pray and not faint," it also unveils the true meaning of prayer and shows us how, in actual fact, to "practise the presence of God." The book falls into five parts, and covers every aspect of the act of praying on its practical side. It addresses itself to the all-important questions: Why we Pray, For What we Pray, How we Pray, When we Pray, and To Whom we Pray. Dr. Jordan's treatment all the way through explains, illustrates and enforces his own simple, yet profound, definition of Prayer as "meeting God." And since men are always meeting God, always being confronted by him, even when they are unaware of the fact, every thought and word and deed is a prayer of some kind. But it is only when these "prayers" (would it not be better to describe them not so much as prayers in themselves as the raw materials out of which genuine prayers are fashioned?) are in accord with the Spirit of Jesus that they become effective in our lives.

Dr. Jordan offers us a worthy, if brief, treatment of a most important subject. Christian people need to be taught how to pray, otherwise exhortations to pray will avail nothing. Indeed, the fact that this volume is not in the ponderous category will command itself to ministers and laymen alike. Dr. Jordan's spiritual insights are couched in simple yet not inelegant prose; his quotations are apt and enlightening; and his illustrations (most of them) are fresh and unhackneyed—indeed, some of them are superb; one of them, in fact, is itself worth almost the price of the book.

Dr. Jordan's aim is to help to make religion real to the ordinary Christian, and his aim will certainly be realized in the lives of those who "read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest" this excellent little monograph, *Prayer That Prevails*.

JOHN PITTS

Minister of St. Andrew's Presbyterian Kirk, Nassau, Bahamas.

Design for Preaching. By H. GRADY DAVIS. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958. xi-307 pp. \$4.75.

Only rarely does a book appear on the homiletical horizon which makes even the most cynical critic rise up to call it blessed. This is such a book. Dr. Davis has written a work on preaching which is destined to become a mile-post in current American homiletical theory.

Most books on preaching say about the same thing—some, of course, better than others. This author comes to the same task of discussing preaching, but does it with freshness and creativity. His main thesis is that "content and form are two inseparable elements of the same thing in the design of a good sermon" (vii). ". . . the relation between them is not mechanical but organic" (p. 20). The sermon substance in the mind has the elements of the form within it. Form is not a static set of principles to be imposed on any sermon content. Each sermon has its own form determined by its substance. "Thought and its expression, content and organization, substance and form, are not two things but one, two inseparable aspects of the same thing" (p. 36). For example, this is why it is difficult to lay down specific rules on structure to fit all sermons. Each sermon will have its own form determined by its function—its purpose.

In a short review it is difficult to refer to the many excellent ideas in the book. A few will suffice: the importance of having the subject *do* something; the functional forms of preaching (proclamation, teaching, and therapy); a very important section on tense and mode in preaching.

With such a rewarding book it is only natural to raise questions, but I am afraid they reveal only a lover's quarrel. Although Dr. Davis has his reasons (explicitly stated in the preface), I find it difficult to see how delivery can be left out of such a book. Since delivery is form, then obviously delivery is part of the substance too. Also, the author sometimes confuses creativity with originality. He refers (often unfavorably) to the literature of homiletics as not approaching some subject in the way he is going to do. Actually he is covering the same old material, but with a new freshness and a different vocabulary. There are some (albeit too few) who maintain the same posture as Dr. Davis when they address the homiletical ball. Granted they use different clubs, they still manage to play around the same course.

RONALD E. SLEETH

Professor of Preaching, Vanderbilt University Divinity School, Nashville, Tennessee.

Love and Conflict: New Patterns in Family Life. By GIBSON WINTER. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1958. 191 pp. \$3.50.

Gibson Winter, a chaplain in World War II, is now assistant professor of ethics and sociology on the University of Chicago's Federated Theological Faculty. *Love and Conflict* interprets the strain of the modern family striving for satisfying intimacy within itself to compensate for the anonymity of a competitive mechanized world.

Families are being constantly uprooted. People need roots, or they lose the sense of security, of belonging. Young people are rushing into marriage as a haven. But absorbing intimacy requires skill and maturity, else it, too, becomes a strain. The man lives in two unrelated worlds. He feels pressure: "Succeed—or else!" He fears failure. He wants to escape to his castle and be loved, just for himself. His wife envies his life in "that exciting wonderful world out there." Perhaps she is frustrated, lonely, unsure of her role as a woman. She may downgrade the value of home-making.

What about family discipline? With father almost an absentee, mother may become "mom," or she may let the children rule. Children need order if they are to learn responsible living. How much freedom should adolescents have? How much regulation? Can a family establish its own pattern without regard to that of the neighborhood? Will a widowed parent be an asset in the home, or will family solidarity be threatened?

Love and growing understanding can find answers to these problems. We must "listen" to each other. We must see one another as we really are, not superimpose our dream picture. We can forgive and be forgiven. We can learn the magic of communication. Father can re-enter the home as a real person, answerable to God for the order and welfare of the family. Mother can sustain him. They stand together. Mother can initiate the community contacts that help a family belong. Both can plan meaningful leisure-time activities. They need a church. Parents and teachers need to work together without mutual suspicion.

Many a church is extending its ministry to create a new type of democratic urban neighborhood. Citizens' councils are breaking down barriers and creating better living conditions.

On the whole, young parents are doing a good job. They are demonstrating their faith in the family. They are building a democratic, meaningful, honest family

life. They are facing their problems realistically, imaginatively. We are entering an era of great family living.

ADA WEHRLY GEYER

Trinity Methodist Church, Newark, New Jersey.

Segregation and the Bible. By EVERETT TILSON. New York: Abingdon Press, 1958. 176 pp. \$2.50 (pap. \$1.50).

The Bible has long been used as a weapon by both sides of the race controversy. In the nineteenth century it was used by both the Abolitionists and pro-slavery apologists. Strangely, it was used by orthodox Southern churchmen, *contra* many scientists of the time, to support the unity of races as descendants of Adam and Eve, for it was partly on the basis of this unity that the churches found their authority and commission to bring the gospel to the slaves.

The appeal to the Bible by fundamentalist segregationists of the twentieth century reveals the depth of their involvement, for the seeking of religious sanctions for segregation illustrates the failure of other sanctions to meet the demands of self-justification. Dr. Tilson has the wisdom not to dismiss this appeal lightly, apparently recognizing that for many it represents a travail of the soul, however tortuous. In a reasoned and scholarly treatment he meets the biblical segregationists on their own ground, persuasively demolishing their arguments, not by blasting at the Scriptures which they use as their basis, but by showing clearly the inadequacy of their biblical interpretation.

He observes that the biblical writers "do not view men as the helpless pawns of either an inexorable past or of an inevitable future," and that they "treat the moral character of God as the one constant among the variables of human history." He deals carefully with the generally used "proof texts" in facing the questions, "Does the Bible demand segregation?" and "Are there biblical precedents for segregation?" He goes on to consider "What are the implications of biblical faith for the Christian approach to segregation?" He concludes that our great need is not for more and better answers, but for a greater and nobler faith, "sufficiently great and noble to call in question the pride with which we have cherished these answers." Would that such a book might find wide circulation in the Bible Belt!

STILES B. LINES

Rector, Grace Episcopal Church, Camden, South Carolina.

Seventh-Day Adventists Answer Questions on Doctrine. Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1957. 720 pp. \$1.50.

Aside from being something of a publishing miracle (720 pages for \$1.50!) this is an elaborate work of doctrinal clarification, written by a group of Seventh-Day Adventist writers, counselors and editors. Lacking the imprimatur of their General Conference, it is not "official," but an explanation and expansion of their Fundamental Beliefs (pp. 11-18). There is nothing new about it, nor was there intended to be; it may win no converts, but it should correct many an error and unenlightened criticism on the part of those who have never quite understood what it is all about. For these it was written.

These Adventists, we gather, have more in common with conservative Christianity than most conservative Christians seem willing to admit; many of their items

of faith have close parallels in orthodox Protestantism. But they take "one of two or more alternate views" on "certain controverted doctrines" (on salvation, immortality, baptism, hell and punishment, etc.), while on others they are still peculiarly Seventh-Day (on the heavenly sanctuary, the investigative judgment, the interpretation of Revelation, and the unique position and contribution of Ellen G. White). The attempt to explain Mrs. White (she was neither prophet nor prophetess but a "messenger" with the gift of the Spirit of prophecy) will leave some still in confusion if not in doubt; but on the whole the book is refreshing in its clarity and candor. They know Whom they have believed, and what, and why. They show a freedom of interpretation and expression which will surprise many beyond the pale, commanding respect if not agreement. It is one of the ablest and most comprehensive books available in the field of denominational doctrine and, thank heaven and the editors, it is actually readable. Even the layman can enjoy it!

FRANK S. MEAD

Editor-in-Chief, Fleming H. Revell Company, Westwood, New Jersey.

Essentials of New Testament Study. By ERIC LANE TITUS. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1958. vii-261 pp. \$3.75.

The preface of Eric Lane Titus' book clearly sets forth the author's purpose. He intends "to introduce the beginning student to the more important aspects" of this field of research (p. iii). This aim demands the omission of technical problems and is accomplished by dividing the material discussed into three major sections. Part I concerns the Jewish matrix within which Jesus and the Church had their origin; Part II, the beginnings of Gentile Christianity and Paul's life and thought; Part III, later Christian developments.

Of the material discussed the author has indicated a mastery of Pauline literature, the problems of Paul's missionary work and the complexity of his thought. It seems doubtful, however, that Paul was as thoroughly sacramentalist as the author indicates (pp. 110, 123), or that Paul introduced his discussion of Christian love "as an aside" in his treatment of spiritual gifts (p. 132). Equally doubtful is the suggestion that Paul regarded faith, hope and love as Christian "virtues."

One's theological presuppositions color one's discussion of New Testament materials. Hence this reviewer cannot subscribe to the statement that the New Testament is a book about religion. It deals primarily with the theme of redemption. The dynamic aspect of this theme is lost when the author maintains that Jesus' teaching concerns "human brotherhood" (p. 64), a term much too abstract, and that he regards God as a "monotheistic principle" (p. 69). In fact, the author's discussion of Jesus' mission and messages impresses this reviewer as ineffective and vague, e.g., that Jesus viewed his power over demons "as an *aspect* of the new reign of God" (p. 67), that sin is "missing the mark" (pp. 72-73), and that "his religion was a religion of inwardness" (pp. 74, 77, 79).

The book would have been more useful to the beginning student had the author included in his bibliography primary source material (e.g., references to Josephus' works, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Mishnah) and books which represent recent scholarly research in the field of New Testament literature.

LUCETTA MOWRY

Associate Professor of Biblical History, Literature and Interpretation, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

For Brethren Only. By KERMIT EBY. Elgin, Ill.: The Brethren Press, 1958. 234 pp. \$3.00.

For three reasons this is a good book. First, it gives the most human kind of insight into the nature of The Brethren; second, it is an excellent autobiography of Kermit Eby; and third, it demonstrates the positive value of a religion of absolutes.

Kermit Eby has been the center of many storms. His role in organized labor, as a fearless social prophet, as a sociologist, as a civil libertarian, and as a crusader for world peace, has made his name synonymous with controversy for the past twenty-five years. At times even his best friends won't tell him that his optimism is ridiculous—at other times he shows the most fearless side of himself when his enemies are sure that he will fall. Through it, admitting far more errors than we expected, Eby shows a growing dependence on the faith of his fathers (Brethren) and brings his reader to the point that he would seek out some of this "old time religion."

Yet it is full of too many quick and easy answers to the complex problems; it is not always funny when Eby seems to think it is; it will offend those who are in a pious rut. But having said all of that, it is a thrilling piece of testimony on how the gates of hell cannot prevail.

E. S. B.

The Case for Spiritual Healing. By DON H. GROSS. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1958. xiii-263 pp. \$3.95.

The Churches' Handbook for Spiritual Healing. By WALTER W. DWYER. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1958. 80 pp. (pap.). 50¢.

The Rev. Don Gross is one of the leading clergymen in the movement of spiritual healing now in progress in the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh. He writes both in view of the present resurgence of interest in spiritual healing and of criticisms it has called forth. While he reviews what is happening, with several carefully checked case histories, he is concerned to "put those events in a fuller theological background, so that both the principles and the meaning of that healing will be more clearly seen." He believes strongly that the church is called to heal, as the Master did; but he also recognizes the danger of overemphasis on healing at the expense of other elements in the Gospel.

He speaks of the dangers of oversimplified or theologically ungrounded approaches (e.g., Christian Science) in which symptoms can be cured, but at the expense of retreat into unreality, disastrous ignoring of medical science, and the overlooking of sin and self-centeredness. "If spiritual healing is to win wider acceptance, it must develop the most adequate theology possible" (p. 152). He states that while only a small fraction of those seeking healing experience miraculous restoration, more are improved in physical or mental health by the ministrations, and "practically everyone" benefits spiritually. "If healing is not complete in this life, shall we deny that it is healing?" (p. 209). "This much is certain: Christ did not command a multitude of trivial activities with which we ministers all too often busy ourselves. He did command us to heal the sick" (p. 213).

The second-named work is a pamphlet by Walter W. Dwyer of West Dennis, Mass. Author of a previous widely-commended pamphlet surveying present spiritual healing practices, he has now produced this more complete guide to the various

personalities, churches, methods, and thought in this field, including a bibliography. Available from the publisher, Samuel Weiser, 752 Broadway, New York 3; discount on quantity orders.

E. H. L.

The Commission on Higher Education of the National Council of Churches has brought out a pamphlet, *The Theological Idea of the University*, by George H. Williams (\$1.00). This is a revision of "An Excursus on Church, Commonwealth, and College," included in *The Harvard Divinity School—Its Place in Harvard University and in American Culture* (Beacon Press, 1954), which Professor Williams edited. Rich in historical analysis, it is a brilliant contribution to thought on the Vocation of the Christian College.

Two experienced physicians, J. Roswell Gallagher and Herbert I. Harris, have written a book, *Emotional Problems of Adolescents*, for "all who deal with adolescents, whether in groups or individually" (Oxford, \$3.50). They emphasize that "although adolescents have problems, the adolescent boy or girl is a *person*, not a *problem*." "There is more wisdom, insight and common sense about adolescents in this book than I have encountered in any other volume" (Bishop Gerald Kennedy).

W. A. Visser 't Hooft has made an interesting venture into an unexpected field in his *Rembrandt and the Gospel* (Westminster, \$4.50). He examines and reinterprets Rembrandt's life and art from the primary and secondary sources, and traces the artist's developing treatment of New Testament themes; finds Rembrandt to be unique among artists in his insight into biblical meanings.

J.-J. von Allmen, of the University of Neuchâtel, Switzerland, has edited *A Companion to the Bible*—the work of thirty-six Protestant scholars on "the most important words in the Holy Scriptures," "the major theological terms and ideas defined and explained." This English translation, done by an interdenominational group of English scholars, has an introduction by H. H. Rowley. Oxford, \$6.00.

Professor Rowley himself has edited a volume useful to scholars, *Eleven Years of Bible Bibliography*—being the Book Lists of the Society for Old Testament Study 1946-1956—comprehensive, complete, international in scope. The books cited cover the Old Testament and its related fields, are arranged under topics, with brief descriptions and appraisals of each work. The Falcon's Wing Press, Indian Hills, Colorado, \$7.50.

Christian Unity in North America: A Symposium, edited by J. Robert Nelson (Bethany Press, \$3.50), is a collection of highly significant articles which for the most part were published in periodicals before Oberlin, or done for Oberlin study groups. It includes three of the articles in RELIGION IN LIFE's "Oberlin issue," Spring 1957.

E. H. L.



